

A

0
0
0
9
5
7
6
9
3
5



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

RIST AND WAR

WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D.

CRIST AND WAR

BY ROBERT WILSON, D.D.

750

25843

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

CHRIST AND WAR

THE PROBLEM OF THE
CHRISTIAN'S DUTY IN
THE PRESENT AGE

BY
J. H. W. L. [illegible]

CHRIST AND WAR

Outline Programmes for the use of Study Circles
reading "Christ and War" have been prepared
and may be obtained of the Secretary of the
Friends' Central Study Committee,

MISS ELSIE M. SMITH,
Lynhurst,
Hoddesdon,
Herts.

1d. each or 9d. per dozen.

CHRIST AND WAR

THE REASONABLENESS OF DISARMAMENT
ON CHRISTIAN, HUMANITARIAN AND
ECONOMIC GROUNDS

A PEACE STUDY TEXT-BOOK

BY

WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D.

LECTURER AT WOODBROOKE; WARDEN AND
TUTOR OF KINGSMEAD HOSTEL; AUTHOR OF
"ATONEMENT AND NON-RESISTANCE"

WITH A PREFATORY LETTER BY

DR. RENDEL HARRIS

REVISED EDITION

(SECOND IMPRESSION)

LONDON

JAMES CLARKE & CO., 13 & 14 FLEET STREET

CHRIST AND WAR

THE REASONING HERE ON CHRISTIANITY
AND THE UNITED STATES AND
THEIR POLICY

BY JOHN W. B. HARRIS

THIS BOOK
IS DEDICATED TO
MY WIFE

WITHOUT WHOSE HELP
AND ENCOURAGEMENT IT WOULD
NOT HAVE BEEN WRITTEN

THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
1917

PREFATORY LETTER FROM DR. RENDEL HARRIS

CHETWYND HOUSE,
SELLY OAK,
BIRMINGHAM.

DEAR MR. WILSON,—This book which you have written interests me by its method as well as in its subject. It is refreshing to find that you still believe in the validity of the prophetic teachings, and that you do not regard them as entirely displaced by the findings of modern economics, however much we may value and appreciate the corroborations and co-operations of the latter. You still find room in your teaching of peace for Isaiah—and for Jesus! Well! I think you are quite right in this, and that the method does not need much apologetic. If an inspired man tells us that we are not to learn war any more, it is quite safe to annotate him with the remark that “to this feature we must all come,” even if we are painted inches thick with military red. It is the Isaian Quixotism and the Quaker Philadelphianism that is going to win. If the Buddha really said that “never does hatred cease by hate: hatred ceases by love, that is its nature,” then he too has shown us the way out and the way up. As soon as one begins to put this thought into action, the Quixotic labels are brought out: they will be put upon your book, my good friend, as thickly as the continental hotel-keeper distributes his advertisements on one’s travelling trunk. It is clear that you are Quixotic all over.

But let us look at the matter a little more closely. I was recently reading again the splendid article in

Prefatory Letter

Hastings's *Bible Dictionary*, in which Professor Sanday discourses to a charmed world on the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Let us see what he says on the Quixotic method as it colours the Gospels from their centre outward. He tells us that "the world even outside Christianity is still God's world. It is a world in which the essential characteristic is that it is progressive. . . . May we not draw from this the augury that in the end, at some time which we cannot see, the social structure may be still more fully recast, under the influence of Christianity: 'Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' . . . *When that time comes, conduct which now would be only Quixotic might be rational, and required by the public conscience*" (D. B., Vol. II., p. 622). The only criticism I should make upon this peace programme of Professor Sanday is that, by the introduction of the indefinite time limit, the prophets are put off with a compliment, and (would it be too severe to say it) we come near to patronising Jesus Christ, when we might be expected to obey Him. Much has happened in the fifteen years that have elapsed since that article was written; more wars have occurred, more misery has been accumulated, more denial of the Christian spirit has been recorded in the pages of history: but your little book shows that the gulf between the Quixotic and the rational is rapidly filling up (however wide it may have seemed when Dr. Sanday was writing), and you will greatly help us all in calling the public conscience out of its inherited perversity or its habitual inertia. I wish that you may be fiercely attacked, and that you may find the Lord on your right hand, so that you may not be moved.

RENDEL HARRIS.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	ix
I. LETTER AND SPIRIT	13
Question asked, 13. Texts held to imply that Jesus countenanced war, 15—19. Texts quoted against war, 20—24. "Resist not evil," 24—30.	
II. THE KINGDOM AND THE FATHER	31
The great ideas of Jesus: Kingdom of God, 31. Son of Man, 33. The Temptation, 34—40. Present Kingdom, 40. Parables, 41. Practice of Jesus, 43. Following Christ, 46. Fatherhood of God, 46—52. God's conduct to be copied, 49. The Christian power, 52.	
III. MEMBERS OF THE BODY	53
Do New Testament writers countenance war? 54—57. New Testament writers oppose war, 57—69. Union in Death of Christ, 60. Body of Christ, 63. Christlike mind, 66. Primitive Church, 69—74.	
IV. VOICES IN THE WILDERNESS	75
Christians in mediæval and Reformation times who opposed war, 75—85. Quakers, 85—100. Basis of Quaker Testimony against war, 86. Sufferings it entailed, 88. Charges against Quakers, 92. Pennsylvania, 93. Marvellous preservation, 95. Nazarenes, Doukhobors, Tolstoy, 100.	

Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. THE DAWN OF HOPE	103
War an obstacle to advance of Christianity, 103. War barbarous, 105. War irrational, 107. War unprofitable, 110. Ancient warfare, 111. Modern warfare, 112. Property of nations, 114. Investments, 114. Morocco difficulty, 117. Franco-Prussian War, 119. Fallacies of conquest, 120.	
VI. IS IT IMPOSSIBLE ?	126
Answers to objections. War a selective agency, 127. War advances civilisation, 130. Decreed by natural law, 136. Good moral effects, 137. Necessary to settle disputes, 140. Justice requires war, 142. Barbarian invasion, 145. Human passion, 148.	
VII. REASON <i>versus</i> FORCE	152
Facts of modern life which make for peace, 152. Decrease in personal violence, 152. Slavery, 153. Torture, 154. Punishment, 155. Education, 156. Decreasing importance of war, 157. Modern movements require peace, 159. Cross division of society, 161. Arbitration, 163—167. Why war continues, 167. Vested interests, 169. Conscription, 171. Conscription in Australasia, 174.	
VIII. WHAT SHALL WE DO ?	176
Summary, 176. Arguments converge, 177. Individual duty and public policy, 177. No blind fate, 178. Methods of working for peace, 178—202. Education, 179. Attempts to influence policy, 181. Arbitration, 182. Right of capture, 185. Disarmament, 187. Great Britain's opportunity, 191. Spirit of war, 195. Foreign missions, 196. Social betterment, 199. The Spirit of Peace, 201.	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	203
INDEX	208

INTRODUCTION

THE author, in common with all who desire peace between the nations, owes a debt of gratitude to Norman Angell. For, whether one agrees or disagrees with his arguments in "The Great Illusion," it is undeniable that he has brought the question of peace and war prominently and freshly before the public in this and other countries. So that peace advocates no longer speak to deaf ears. Hitherto they have found the public unwilling to listen to them, and inclined to view their theories as a mild form of insanity. "The Great Illusion" has changed this attitude by showing that between civilised states war can bring no gain to the victor, and, under certain circumstances, may damage him even more than the vanquished. At once perpetual peace has become an ideal which the practical man can recognise as capable of realisation.

The Christian and humanitarian peace advocacy claimed that war is wrong and should therefore be abolished. At this the practical man shook his head and said, "War is certainly horrible; it is bad; but it is necessary. It is part of the nature of things; you can't abolish it." Now, if Norman Angell is right in his main contentions, it is no longer possible to say that war cannot be abolished. For it is clearly to the advantage of all men to abolish it; all that stands in the way is human ignorance and prejudice, and in every department of life these are constantly being overcome.

The theories of Norman Angell and the theories of the older Pacifism are then in no sense contradictory but complementary. Each approaches the matter from its own side, but their conclusion is the same. The older Pacifism says, "War is wicked; it ought to be abolished." The newer Pacifism says, "War is futile; it can be dispensed with." Both unite in saying, "War must go."

The object of the present work is then threefold:—

- I. To state clearly the Christian objection to war.
- II. To show how the Christian position is supported by the economic arguments of Norman Angell.

Introduction

III. To suggest that since the peace ideal is recognised as no longer entirely beyond the bounds of practical politics, it may perhaps also be possible that the application of the ethical teaching of Jesus to our whole social life is not so impracticable as the practical man imagines. That, in short, it might even be advantageous to do right. A few words more on two of these points may help the reader to gain the best point of view for studying the succeeding chapters.

I. This Christian objection to war may be approached from two sides. (a) It may be shown how the spirit of Christ, living and working in the lives of His followers, convinces those who trust His guidance that war is anti-Christian. For all men have in them a spark of the Divine, so that no man is entirely beyond the reach of love and persuasion. But the use of violence and war is the denial of this. In some such way the early Friends came to their "Testimony against all War." For the individual who experiences such divine leadings, this is, no doubt, an absolutely unanswerable argument against war. But others may quite rightly ask, "How am I to know that such suggestions come from the Spirit of God, and are not weak sentimental impulses of merely human origin?" For a sufficient answer to such a question, an objective standard is needed. Christians believe that God has revealed Himself to man in Jesus Christ, and therefore:—(b) In the life, teaching and death of Jesus Christ the criterion is given by which we are to judge whether war sometimes may be Christian or is always anti-Christian.

These two methods of approach are not entirely different. Both consist of the attempt to discover what the spirit of Christ teaches. It is the latter which has been used in the following pages, because it has the advantage of dealing more with outward facts than with inward feelings.

The teaching of the New Testament alone has been taken as normative. For, on the one hand, the morality of the Old Testament, being founded on an incomplete revelation of God, is by that very fact

Introduction

admittedly imperfect. And, on the other hand, the teaching of the Christian Church in ages subsequent to Jesus Christ has at times fallen far below that of the New Testament. Jesus Christ, as shown us in the pages of the New Testament, must be our standard.

III. As has been pointed out, starting from different data, the two forms of peace advocacy reach the same conclusion. Economics and a rational understanding of international relationship, confirm the Christian ideal in the matter of peace and war. Ought not this to be a cause of great general encouragement to all Christian people? Does it not indicate that perhaps if we only had a sufficient knowledge of the facts we should find that in every moral and social problem the method that accords with the highest Christian ethics is also the method that will bring success and prosperity?

If we really believed that the God who in Jesus Christ has revealed Himself to us in human form, is also the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe, we should be confident that the only way to achieve real success or permanent prosperity is to take the principles which guided Jesus Christ and the methods He used as our principles and methods.

The Christian, since he knows God in Jesus Christ, cannot believe that what is morally wrong can be necessary for the best interests of any man or nation. This belief is in process of being justified in one sphere of life. It will in the end be justified everywhere. But progress towards the complete realisation of the rule of God in the world will be slow if we are always to wait the halting processes of reasoning to confirm what the Spirit of God teaches, before we attempt to put it into practice. Nor can we suppose that, under present conditions, the right course of action will necessarily always lead to outward success and prosperity for the one who takes it. It is a fact that men have power to mar the Divine harmony, and that by their adherence to what is contrary to their own best interests they can both hinder the Divine purposes and cause suffering to those who are working for better things. But the advance of mankind

Introduction

from disunity and anarchy towards the goal of the brotherhood of man under the rule of the Almighty Father depends on the willingness of those who see the better way to persevere in it to the end. They may be despised and hated, called traitors and fools, and their end may be death and apparent failure. Yet it is they who are saving the world, and if in so doing they themselves perish, did not their Master meet that fate, too? If, then, the struggle for any reform brings failure or death to those who lead in the struggle, that is no proof either that the desired good is unattainable, or that it is not worth the struggle. For Christ died, and through dying He conquered.

Does not the Church¹ suffer to-day from lack of faith? Had she only believed her Lord in the sense of believing in His methods, and following Him, she would long ago have put an end not only to war but to many other forms of social evil. And faith is necessary for such a work. Faith, if applied, will move the mountain long before experts have decided whether it can be moved or not.

NOTE TO SECOND EDITION

The present edition is a reprint of that issued in December, 1913. Statements therefore appear which assume we are at peace (*e.g.*, p. 147). In a few cases a slight modification has been made in the text or a footnote added, but it has been thought best to make no great alteration, as we are not yet in a position to discuss the present war in all its bearings. It may, however, be said that the events of the past few months have confirmed the writer's chief contentions, that war is essentially unchristian, and that its abolition can bring nothing but gain materially, morally and spiritually. In particular the hoary fallacy, "If you want peace, prepare for war," is discredited.

November, 1914.

¹ By Church is meant, here and elsewhere, not any particular organisation, but the whole body of professing Christians.

CHRIST AND WAR

CHAPTER I

LETTER AND SPIRIT

At the present time we hear much of the New Pacifism, the contention associated with the name of Norman Angell, that the day of war is over, that conquest now can bring no profit to the conqueror, and that civilised states, if they were truly enlightened, would agree rapidly to disarm.

Occasionally from those who speak of this New Pacifism one hears slighting remarks about the Old Pacifism of the Peace Society, which was based on Christian or humanitarian grounds, as though it were useless and out of date. And amongst the sincere advocates of Peace on Christian grounds there is sometimes to be observed a little uneasiness in contemplating this economic Peace advocacy. They appear to think that to prove war unprofitable goes far to proving that it cannot be wrong.

It is in the firm conviction that these two lines of Peace advocacy are complementary to one another and ought to be mutually helpful that these pages have been written.

In the later chapters the New Pacifism will be considered; at present our business is with the Old, and the question which we have to answer is: Are those Peace advocates right who maintain that *the spirit from which war springs is the opposite of that*

Christ and War

presented by the life, teaching, and death of Jesus Christ, and that in so far as a Christian takes part in war he is falling away from the standard of Christ and allowing his life to be ruled by the power which opposes the Divine work in the world ?

It will be observed that we do not ask in the first instance "May a Christian country rightly wage war?" but "May the individual Christian take part in war, or (what from a moral point of view is much the same thing) countenance it?"

In answering this question we need an objective standard by which we may judge of the Christian's duty. The historical Christ in His teaching and example gives us such a standard.

The position towards Jesus Christ taken up by this book is Christian in the full sense of the term. That is to say, that in Him it is held that we have the supreme revelation of God. This revelation, though in itself a unity, may be regarded in a number of different ways, of which the following appear to the writer the most important. Jesus Christ brings us :—

- (i) Forgiveness, that is, restoration of communion with God.
- (ii) An example and teaching which are the basis and standard of right conduct for His followers.
- (iii) The Divine power to carry out that teaching.

It is with the second and third of these that we shall here be concerned.

When we speak of His example and teaching we do not mean to imply that in His life all the problems were presented to Him that we have to face, nor that in His sayings every conceivable circumstance of life is contemplated. We rather mean that we can recognise in His conduct the practical working out in the particular circumstances in which He lived of fundamental moral principles, and, further, that

Letter and Spirit

these principles are to be discovered in His teaching, not stated, it is true, in the scholastic form suitable to a text book of ethics, but rather in the more concrete manner of every-day life. Therefore in studying His life and teaching we must endeavour to discern the spirit through the letter. It will not be sufficient to bring forward a number of separate texts which, on the face of them, may be held to show that our Saviour would have His followers take no part in war—we must rather endeavour to gain some insight into the thoughts and ideals which were fundamental to Him, and to discover what bearing these have on the question under discussion.

But, while we do not intend to base our arguments on proof texts, we shall do well to discuss both those generally quoted to show that our Lord disapproved of war, and those which are held to prove that in certain circumstances it has His approval. We will take the latter first. The contention that Jesus Christ countenanced war is supported by passages which may be conveniently classified under three heads :—

I. Sayings which appear definitely to encourage resort to arms.

II. Parables in which military metaphors and similes are used.

III. Passages which relate how Christ had dealings with military men and does not appear to have reproved them for their occupation.

I. Three verses are very frequently quoted in proof of this contention.

(a) Mark xiii. 7 (and parallels in Matthew and Luke) : “ And when ye hear of wars and rumours of wars be not troubled ; these things must needs come to pass.” It is argued from these words that our Saviour prophesied wars in the future, and that,

Christ and War

therefore, they will and must continue, and that to do anything to prevent them continuing would be impious. To this we answer that even if the validity of this argument be granted (and we shall see reason to doubt its validity), it is not proved that He desired His followers to take part in wars. In fact the study of the context shows that wars are but one item amongst many in the tale of the woes that He foresaw, and that His purpose in mentioning them was that His disciples might not be needlessly terrified in these times of trouble, but might trust in God. All through this chapter the Church is looked upon as the sufferer, never as the inflicter of evils. And, further, it is to be noted that the early part of the chapter, at least where the words in question occur, appears to apply to the destruction of Jerusalem—and has therefore already been fulfilled.

We may, then, say in answer to this argument :—

- (i) Jesus did not in these words either desire His disciples to fight or countenance their doing so.
- (ii) The events He foresaw and spoke of happened nearly 1,850 years ago, and we have, therefore, no right to apply His words to the present or future.

(b) “ Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword ” (Matt. x. 34).

This can scarcely be a sober statement of the purpose of Christ's coming, for as such it is irreconcilable with most of His teaching. And the words which follow it, “ I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law,” if looked upon as giving the real intention of Christ's coming, make it impossible to believe that He said, “ Love your enemies,” and enunciated the Golden

Letter and Spirit

Rule. Obviously if we are to take the first part of the saying literally we must take the second part literally too. If it is seriously argued that Jesus *intended* wars to result from His coming, and *intended* His followers to take part in them, we are forced to conclude that family quarrels and the sharing in them of His disciples was also in His purpose. May we not rather say that He uses here a common figure of speech by which the result of an action (in this case only a small part of the result) is spoken of as its purpose? ¹

(c) In Luke xxii. 36 Jesus, in solemn words at the last supper, tells His disciples to sell their garments and buy swords.

It is probable that we no longer possess the means of understanding this saying, but that it implies that Jesus intended His followers then or later to resort to arms seems unlikely, because:—

(i) It is quite clear from the Gospels that Jesus knew He was going to His death, and did not attempt to evade it.

(ii) Jesus also appears to have said that two swords were enough (v. 38): this they certainly were not if intended for the defence of twelve men.

(iii) When one disciple used his sword, Jesus sternly rebuked him (Matt. xxvi. 51, 52).

(iv) There is no trace in any account we have of the early Church that its members defended themselves against persecutors.

That the early Church was perplexed by this verse may be seen by the passages in which the Fathers explain away its evident discordance with

¹ Compare Mark iv. 12, where "that seeing they may see and not perceive," etc., clearly implies not purpose, but result.

Christ and War

the faith and practice of the Church. The most striking example of this is, perhaps, to be found in the comment of one of the great Syrian commentators to the following effect:—"Our Lord allowed them to take wallets and swords, *like men who cease from confidence in Him*, saying, 'It is not My word that ye are thus about to do.' In many copies, instead of 'let him buy a sword and take it,' it is written, 'Pray for your enemies.'"¹

Generally it must be said of all these passages that they can only be understood in the light of the total impression of all that Jesus Christ said and was.

II. The use of military figures in parables.

(a) Luke xiv. 31: "What king, as he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?"

Here the forethought of the king in such matters is recommended. So ought the disciples of Jesus to realise the difficulties which they have to face. Such a passage is simply an illustration drawn from ordinary life of what our Saviour had to teach in the spiritual sphere. It gives us no clue whatever to the attitude which He occupied towards war.

(b) Luke xi. 21—22: "When the strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils."

This simile of the strong man armed is frequently quoted by those who desire us to increase our armaments. It appears to be thought that Jesus by mentioning him approves of him. But if one reads

¹ This paragraph was supplied by Dr. Rendel Harris.

Letter and Spirit

the preceding verses carefully, it becomes quite clear that the "strong man" in question is none other than the devil.

If then we are still to apply the simile to a nation that arms against invasion, we find ourselves comparing the action to the conduct of the prince of darkness. But, of course, this simile has nothing whatever to do with the question under discussion. Its clear meaning is simply that the fact that Jesus, "the stronger man" of the parable, had power to cast out evil spirits proved that He had conquered the kingdom of darkness. This conquest was no conquest of the violent by violence, but was achieved through trust in God and love to man. We shall later on see reason to think that this conquest was begun when He passed scatheless through temptation, and was consummated when His trust in God led Him through suffering and death.

III. Jesus had to do with soldiers, as had John the Baptist before Him, and His disciples after Him. Yet neither He nor they ever appear to have reproved any soldier for his profession, and Jesus himself in one case very heartily commends the faith of an officer (Luke vii. 9; Matt. viii. 10). It is suggested, then, that if Jesus had really disapproved of war under all circumstances—if He had occupied towards it anything approaching the Quaker position—He could not have failed to recommend this officer to desert his profession.

At first sight this suggestion sounds probable, but it is really based on a misunderstanding of the method of Christ's teaching. His words in the Gospels are not a series of commands and prohibitions. The object of His teaching was not to deliver to men a higher and better law than the Mosaic. It was to bring them into a new life by communicating to them a measure of His own consciousness of rela-

Christ and War

tionship with God. In this, as in many cases, we receive most light on the teaching of Jesus from the writings of His greatest apostle. Paul teaches us that in Jesus Christ the law as an exterior standard to which man must conform is set on one side, while at the same time its essential object is fulfilled by the new life in Christ which produces in the lives devoted to Him those virtues which the law demanded and yet never could produce.¹

Applying this principle to the case of the centurion, we may believe that the spirit of Christ working in him would in time show him the incompatibility of his profession with that spirit, and cause him to resign his commission. We have cases on record in the early Church in which this happened.²

¹ It would indeed not be far from the truth to say that Jesus Christ only gave His followers one command, a command which already stood in the Jewish law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The rest of His moral teaching is comment on this. He enlarged the meaning of the term "neighbour," and enriched our idea of Love.

² Jesus is not recorded to have reproved soldiers, neither is He recorded to have reproved *harlots*. In fact we quite clearly are given to understand that the Pharisees disapproved of Him because He did not do so.

Neither in this case where Jesus had to do with a soldier, nor in the cases where His disciples had dealings with them (Acts x. and elsewhere), is there any reference to the legitimacy of the military profession or to right conduct in it; in one passage only in the New Testament does anything of the sort occur, viz., Luke iii. 14, where John the Baptist, at the request of the soldiers who heard him preach, instructed them as to their duty. Seeing that he did not tell them to desert their profession, this passage has been construed as a justification of war. But the command "Do violence to no man!" is not compatible with the ordinary methods of war. Understood as applying to the conduct of soldiers in war, it is a command which cannot be obeyed; but the Roman soldiers of John's time were police far more than fighting soldiers. And the command can be understood

Letter and Spirit

We now consider the texts which are most frequently quoted to show that Jesus Christ forbade to His followers all participation in war. They are the following :—

- (a) " All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them " (Matt. vii. 12).
- (b) " Love your enemies " (Matt. v. 44).
- (c) " Blessed are the peacemakers " (Matt. v. 9).
- (d) " All that take the sword shall perish with the sword " (Matt. xxvi. 52).
- (e) " My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight " (John xviii. 36).
- (f) " Resist not evil " (Matt. v. 39).

In discussing passages quoted on the opposite side, we endeavoured to see how far their apparent meaning was borne out by their context, the circumstances under which they were uttered, and their agreement or otherwise with other sayings of Jesus ; and we must subject these passages to a similar scrutiny.

In the case of three of them, (a), (b), and (c), the meaning is obvious, and is in no sense modified by a consideration of the context ; in fact, in the case of (b), " Love your enemies," the context distinctly emphasises the natural meaning of the words. If love under the Mosaic law was to be confined to men of one's own race, under the rule of Christ as a reference to that side of the soldier's work. " Carry out your police work, and do it without violence " may be taken to be the meaning of the words. Far, then, from justifying war, which always will and must use violence on men, John's words justify police work, *but only in so far as that does not use violent methods*. Not only is war in no way countenanced, but even methods of violence in keeping the peace are discouraged.

Christ and War

there is no such restriction, but rather an expansion to embrace all men, even those who are opposed to us. It is difficult to reconcile either this command or the Golden Rule with the practice of warfare. Passage (c), "Blessed are the peacemakers," it is true, does not forbid war; it rather emphasises the positive duty of conciliation and prevention of war. All Christians, whether they believe that war is entirely forbidden them or not, can and must unite in being peacemakers.

The other three verses quoted must be considered more closely.

(d) "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. xxvi. 52).

This is part of our Lord's rebuke to Peter when he had used his sword in defence of his Master—surely the noblest use to which sword was ever put! Of this passage Tertullian says: "The Lord, by His disarming of Peter, disarmed every soldier from that time forward." On this passage, too, J. Weiss, in his popular commentary on the Gospels,¹ remarks, "Defence with the sword is not only contrary to the spirit of Jesus but to that of the whole of primitive Christianity." It is clear, then, that in both ancient and modern times this passage has been looked upon as decisive of the attitude of Jesus towards war. It also shows that Jesus held that violence can never produce righteousness and peace. For those who take the sword perish either by the sword at the hand of other men, or still having to use their sword (the words are capable of either interpretation)—that is to say, no finality is reached. Either they fall victims to the violence which has been raised up to oppose their own violence, or they

¹ J. Weiss in "Schriften des Neuen Testaments neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt," Bd. I., p. 392.

Letter and Spirit

are compelled continually to use violence to keep that which violence has obtained for them.

- (e) "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews" (John xviii. 36).

On the face of it this passage appears to contain the very definite implication that the servants of Christ may not fight. But apparently it is not always so understood. It is said: "Certainly the servant of Christ may not fight for the Kingdom of God; that Kingdom is not one of the kingdoms of the world, and cannot be advanced by war; but in so far as the servant of Christ also belongs to one of the kingdoms of the world he is, by this verse, expressly allowed to fight." Thus we get the view that we are forbidden to fight for what is most important, but are allowed to fight for things of lesser value. This in itself is such an astonishing conclusion as to make a sober thinker doubt whether it can be valid. And a closer study of the teaching of Jesus and of the attitude of the early Church towards the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of the world shows that it cannot be accepted. By such a study two points become clear:—

(i) Jesus regarded the Kingdom of God as the one supreme object of desire and effort of His disciples, in which all other things necessary to life are contained.

(ii) The early Church saw a very distinct opposition between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of the world. No divided allegiance was possible to the disciples of Christ. If the demands of the emperor conflicted with the demands of Christ, Christ alone must be obeyed, and that at any cost. Not a few Christians in the first few centuries are

Christ and War

known to have suffered martyrdom for refusal to serve in the army.

We are then to understand this verse as strongly emphasising the difference between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of the world. The latter use warlike weapons, their power is based on outward compulsion, and on oppression and fear. The former does not use warlike weapons; its "weapons are not of the flesh, but mighty before God" (2 Cor. x. 4), and its power is based on an inward change and love that takes away all fear (1 John iv. 18), and brings a new and freer life to man.

The obvious meaning of our text is, then, that the servants of Christ do not fight, and that any attempt to find in it permission to fight under certain circumstances, or for certain objects, postulates a divided allegiance—the service of both God and Mammon—which Jesus expressly says is impossible (Matt. vi. 24).

(f) "Resist not evil" (Matt. v. 39).

Of all the sayings of Jesus understood to prohibit war this is the most frequently quoted, and probably the most important. But it is clearly the duty of every Christian to resist all moral evil and at least some sorts of physical evil. Was not Christ's victory over temptation a resistance of moral evil? Was not His healing of the sick a resistance of physical evil? It is plain, then, from the best commentary we possess on the words of Jesus—His actions—that these words are not to be taken in their widest possible sense. A literal rendering of the Greek in this verse would give us "Resist not the evil one," which, if the words are to bear their ordinary meaning, is impossible. But it is probable that the revisers have given the intention of the passage by translating "him that is evil"—in other words, "an evil-doer." The text deals with our atti-

Letter and Spirit

tude towards persons. But instances occur to us at once where resistance offered to a person appears not only for the general good, but even for the good of the one to whom it is offered. For instance, it is wise and kind to keep a drunkard locked up or under the charge of someone who may on occasion have to use forcible means to restrain him from obtaining what can only be the ruin of his life. Similarly, for their own good, as well as that of the community, lunatics are kept under restraint. And probably even the most advanced educationalists would agree that circumstances *do* arise when force of some sort has to be used on children.

For a true understanding of the text we must look at the context. It occurs in the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus contrasts the demands of the old law with His demands. The essential point of all these contrasts is that the demands of Jesus go deeper than those of the Mosaic code. He requires not merely that outward wrongdoing—murder, adultery, false swearing—be abandoned, but much more, that no anger or lust or lying be cherished in the heart. So in this contrast we may expect to find something more spiritual than the Mosaic enactment.

Coming to the section, v. 38—42, we notice that the Mosaic law of satisfaction is now entirely done away. It is fulfilled by being abolished, paradoxical as that sounds, for its real intention was to prevent an injured party inflicting on the injurer a greater injury than he himself had received—that is, it taught some consideration even for an offender. The law of Christ teaches free forgiveness for an offender.

This is what is meant by "Resist not evil." An adequate paraphrase would be "Forgive the evil-doer." The thought is then developed. If one

Christ and War

forgives an injury, it means that one allows a repetition of that injury, hence one must "turn the other cheek," or allow a man who has already wrongfully possessed himself of one's shirt to have one's overcoat too. These directions do not preclude reasoning with the offender or attempting to make him see that he is doing wrong; but they cannot be reconciled with hating him or desiring to be revenged upon him.

There are two points to be noted about the treatment of the opposer allowed in the Mosaic law with which this command of Jesus is contrasted:—

(i) The punishment—which may be thoroughly deserved—is inflicted by the injured party himself—that is, he is judge in his own quarrel.

(ii) The punishment is simply retributive—it is revenge pure and simple; there is no thought of remedial treatment which will save the sinner.

Instead of this, Jesus suggests a mode of treatment which springs from love. The evil-doer is not to be resisted; he is rather to be allowed to repeat the injury. But this is not because the sufferer regards what is done as of no consequence, nor because he relies on God's vengeance and therefore will not himself retaliate. The real motive is two-fold.

(i) The injured party as a follower of Christ must not retaliate, because so doing is inconsistent with true love to the injurer, whom, by his Lord's command, he is bound to love. It may be, it will be, difficult for him under the circumstances to feel that love; but if he refrains from letting hate overcome him and express itself in his action, and if he carries out his Master's Golden Rule to "do as he would be done by," he will put himself on God's side and lay open the channel by which God's love may flow through him to his enemy.

Thus, from the point of view of allowing himself

Letter and Spirit

to be a channel of Divine grace to others, non-resistance has been the right course for him.

(ii) If he does resist evil—if, instead of turning the other cheek, he hits back, what happens? There is a fight. Instead of one man with a bruised cheek, or even two bruised cheeks, there will be two men much more bruised, and perhaps seriously injured—that is to say, from a merely material point of view, more damage is done. And what about the spiritual state of the two? Both will be filled with anger, hatred, and schemes of revenge, whereas if the Christian has taken Christ's way he will have conquered his own evil passions, and who can say that he may not have won the other to a better state of mind?

In other words, the method suggested by Jesus Christ tends to lessen the evil in the world. It is, therefore, clearly in the path of advance towards the ideal state of affairs which He called the Kingdom of God.

These two aspects are closely connected. The law of love working in the individual tends to produce the state of things in which the law of love will be supreme in the world.

In taking up the attitude of non-resistance to his personal enemy, the Christian resists moral evil in himself and overcomes it. He is then in no sense taking up a passive attitude. For the conquest of self entails the hardest of all warfares, and that is the conquest to which the Christian is called.

To sum up, then, this saying indicates what is in certain circumstances the expression in practice of the great law of love, which is applicable to all circumstances. Therefore its applicability or otherwise in special cases is to be judged, not by any external standard, but by the endeavour to discover what action true love will prompt. To the question,

Christ and War

then, "Is war compatible with the teaching of Jesus in this saying?" we reply uncompromisingly, No, unless it can be shown that to make war or to defend ourselves against anyone is an expression of love, springing from a sincere wish to do to others as we would that they should do to us. The more we recognise what war really means the less can we suppose that it can ever spring from such a root.

Probably many will reply to what has been said so far: "We do not deny that Jesus taught us to love our enemies, and not to retaliate when personally injured, but these commands apply to the individual in his private capacity, and not to the actions of states. States have as their primary duty the protection of the lives and property of their citizens; if these are endangered, they may rightly go to war on their behalf."

This implies that while the individual citizen ought not, as a Christian, to take revenge for injuries inflicted upon himself nor to protect himself from their repetition, the state to which he belongs may do this for him. We may ask then, firstly, what is to be the attitude of the injured individual in the matter? Secondly, how far the action of the state is consistent with its citizens following the commands of Jesus Christ?

(i) The attitude of the injured individual. As a Christian he is bound to practise love and forgiveness to his private enemies. Therefore he cannot ask the state to undertake revenge for him, or even to protect him in so far as this protection implies doing injury to his enemies. Further, if the true Christian spirit of love and forgiveness is really ruling in his life, he will not be able to find satisfaction in the state, of its own accord, or at the request of another, taking up his quarrel. For even

Letter and Spirit

that would imply a desire to be revenged on his enemy. The truly Christian man should not desire revenge, and should trust in God for protection.

(ii) How far is the action of the state in undertaking revenge for one of its citizens, or in endeavouring to protect him *by injury of other men*, consistent with its citizens acting in the Christian spirit?

It must be freely granted that there is something of nobleness and unselfishness in taking up arms to protect someone else, and thus far the action is nearer to a truly Christian spirit than is that of the individual who protects *himself*. But Jesus Christ requires of His followers to *love* their enemies. It may be said that the individual, in attempting to destroy the state's enemies, has no personal animosity to them—that they are not his enemies and he does not hate them. The soldier fights because his country demands it of him. He has no feelings one way or another towards those whom it is his duty to destroy. This, I repeat, may be said, but the testimony of multitudes who have taken part in wars is that in battle a perfectly devilish hatred of one another is stirred in the opposing armies, that soldiers feel a fierce and terrible joy in killing.

And if the war is made ostensibly in revenge for injuries done to some member of the avenging nation, it is a matter of common knowledge that hatred is widely felt and expressed both in the country generally and in the army.

Therefore, it seems clear that a state, in undertaking such revenge for, or protection of, its own citizens by *injury of others*, is requiring of its citizens actions and passions incompatible with the teaching of Jesus.

To this it may be answered, "No state is yet entirely Christian, and we cannot therefore expect

Christ and War

all its actions to be guided by Christian motives." This is quite true, but our question is not what we may expect that states in their present semi-heathen condition will do, but what, if truly Christian, they ought to do? The duty of the individual Christian member of such a state will then be, firstly, to strive to make the state Christian and to bring its actions into conformity with Christian standards; secondly, to maintain the true Christian standard in his own case. This will imply, also, urging his fellow countrymen to act in the Christian way, and protesting when his country acts contrary to the teaching of Jesus.

It is therefore assumed in this discussion that while the teaching of Jesus was primarily intended to guide the individual in his private capacity, it has also, through the individual, a very definite bearing on the action of the State; and that it will ultimately accomplish the same results in the State, as, in the first preaching of the Kingdom of God, it designs for the individual.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

The New Testament passages quoted *in their contexts*, and especially the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v.—vii.).

CHAPTER II

THE KINGDOM AND THE FATHER

It is generally recognised that the teaching of Jesus concentrates mainly around two conceptions, both familiar to contemporary Jewish thought, the Kingdom of God and the Fatherhood of God. These were the ways of thinking about God's connection with His people which were best adapted to the message of new life and power which our Lord had to give, yet His treatment of them constantly shows us that His thought of God transcended any such expression. His revelation of God could not be adequately given in words. It is in His own person—in His life and death—that we have the expansion of His words and our best commentary on them.

In treating of the bearing of the idea of the Kingdom of God on the question before us we shall, therefore, consider not only our Lord's teaching, but also His life and death. The Kingdom is in fact intimately connected with its founder—the Messiah.

The thought of a Golden Age, when justice and peace should reign, was familiar to the Jews of our Lord's day. They spoke of this as the Kingdom of God or of Heaven—the terms which Jesus Christ also used. It appears that there were two roughly distinguished views of how this Kingdom was to come prevalent in our Lord's time :—

- (i) A great military hero would arise in Israel,

Christ and War

under whose leadership the people would throw off the yoke of Rome and themselves assume the lordship of the world. The rule of the chosen people would be one of even-handed justice and profound peace. Their King would be the divinely appointed Messiah, who would bring all men to the worship of the true God. Two points are of importance in this expectation :—(a) Perfect peace would prevail under the sway of the Messiah, but his Kingdom would have been gained, as hitherto all human kingdoms had been gained, by violence and the slaughter of his enemies. (b) The king was to be a human king, a descendant of David. His government would be permanent, not because he would himself be immortal, but because his descendants in unbroken succession would follow him.¹

(ii) The other expectation, popular amongst the Pharisees, looked for no human king but for a Divine being, who, not by human means of conquest and destruction, but by a Divine intervention—would acquire sovereignty over the whole world and reign as the vicegerent of Jehovah and the champion of His people.

The root of this conception in the Old Testament was certainly "the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven," who is prominent in Daniel vii. (especially verse 13), though that passage was probably not intended to bear the interpretation put upon it by the Pharisees.

It was then the Pharisees' view that human conquest would not bring the Kingdom, but that God Himself would send His representative in His own

¹ Probably the Old Testament passages out of which this hope grew were Isa. ix. 1—7, and xi. 1—8. For a more adequate treatment of this view of the Kingdom and of the other here spoken of, readers are referred to William Temple's book, "The Kingdom of God," Chap. I.

The Kingdom and the Father

time. But it would be a mistake to think that all human agency was excluded. The diligent keeping of the law by the whole people of Israel would secure God's favour, and as a token of that favour and in fulfilment of all His promises of blessing the Messiah would be sent.

We see in this trait a similarity to our Lord's view of the Kingdom. He expected God *to give the Kingdom*, but to do so when men by obedience and trust had become qualified to receive it.¹

Is there, then, any further resemblance between our Lord's conception of the Kingdom and either of those prevalent in His own day?

There is, of course, the obvious fact that any conception of the Kingdom of God implied the idea of God's rule being effective in the earth and producing the fruits of universal peace and righteousness. Beyond this Christ's conception of the Kingdom appears to have no resemblance to the first type noted.

But when we turn to the second and compare it with His sayings on the subject it appears that He held something like it, for not only does He emphasise the fact that God gives the Kingdom, a very essential feature of the Pharisaic view, but from His adoption of the title "Son of Man," and especially when, in the most solemn moment of His life before the High Priest, He claimed that He would come as *the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven* (Mark xiv. 62), it is clear that He also adopted to some extent the whole conception. But it would be very rash to suppose that He therefore thought of it simply as it was thought of by His contemporaries. No great

¹ The words "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom" occur in close connection with encouragement to trust in God and to obey His will (Luke xii. 32).

Christ and War

man simply shares the conceptions of his generation on important matters, be they political or religious ; genius modifies all that it touches. And can we expect less of Him who has altered the course of history ? Let us then attempt to discover what His view of the Kingdom of God was and how it was related to His own person.

Two facts are of moment here :—

(i) As has been mentioned, He claimed to be the Messiah.

(ii) Yet at the beginning of His ministry this claim was not put forward explicitly, and appears never to have been made perfectly clearly until the last hours of His life.

He is at first the herald of the Kingdom (Mark i. 15), the teacher of the higher righteousness of the Kingdom (the Sermon on the Mount). His parables of the Kingdom (Mark iv.; Matt. xiii.) do not lay great stress upon His own person, and, while in all that He said and did the prophet was manifest to all who were not prejudiced against Him, no one recognised the Messiah until, towards the end of the ministry, by a flash of divine inspiration, Peter discovered His secret.

Nor have we far to seek for the reason for this reticence. Any such claim was bound to have been misunderstood. The story of the Temptation, as recorded by the first and third evangelists, casts a flood of light on our Lord's own conception of His office, and will enable us to understand how impossible it would have been for Him to explain it to the people generally. The definite call to the Messiahship appears to have come in the descent of the Holy Spirit at the Baptism. Then came the struggle—the time of testing. He was driven of the Spirit into the wilderness that, alone with God, He might think out what His work was to be and how He was to do

The Kingdom and the Father

it. The Temptation was no temptation to selfishness, ease, or the satisfaction of the lower nature, but was entirely concerned with the methods of His life-work. Let us take the story as recorded by Luke,¹ whose order appears to be better than Matthew's.

With high aspirations surging within Him, filled with intense devotion to God and carried out of Himself by the greatness of the revelation, He goes far from human habitation, omitting to take any provision for bodily needs. For long, it may be, the lack of food was not felt, but after the long fast the body asserted its claims, and He realised that He was in dire need of food. Then came the temptation. As the Son of God, the divinely-appointed Messiah, all the resources of God were at His service; could He not work a miracle to feed Himself? Two separate impulses probably united in this temptation.

(i) The impulse to satisfy His hunger by means of the miraculous power which He believed Himself to possess.

(ii) The impulse to test that miraculous power and thereby to test the reality of His call.

To give way to either impulse would have shown a lack of trust in God. If God wished Him to make bread of stones, He would tell Him to do so, But the words of the Law came to Him as the voice of God, "Man shall not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord" (Deut. viii. 3). The material must be secondary to the spiritual.

The second temptation is mentioned in pictorial language as a temptation to gain the kingdoms of the world by the worship of the devil. To worship anyone implies admiring his character and copying it. Stated baldly, to worship the devil could be no temptation to any high-minded man, much less

¹ Luke iv. 1—13.

Christ and War

to the Son of God. But to copy his actions in one particular probably appeared a very simple and direct way of gaining His ends. The conception of the Messiah as a conquering king must have come to His mind at this time. It could not be otherwise—many of His contemporaries expected such a deliverer. The experience He had been through assured Him that He was indeed God's chosen ; but He was no heavenly being coming on the clouds of heaven—He was a man, a descendant of David. Naturally and inevitably the temptation came to Him to call together an army, to fulfil the national hope by conquering the Romans and establishing *by force* a kingdom of peace and righteousness, in which men should be *compelled* to do right. This was the simplest, most natural, most obvious of all ways of attaining His purpose. It was the way in which kingdoms had always been founded. Many were attempting it at His own time. Any other man would have accepted it saying, "the end justifies the means." The greatness, the uniqueness, of Jesus is nowhere seen more clearly than in the fact that He recognised this as a temptation of the devil. Satan had disguised himself as an angel of light. To recognise him through that disguise was to conquer him. To use methods of violence, which could not but stir up anger, hatred and cruelty, in order to found the kingdom of love, peace and righteousness, was to use the tools of the devil for the work of God. It is never right to do wrong. Jesus saw this and answered, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Here we have the direct reply of Jesus Christ to all the specious arguments for using war to bring peace, using oppression or injustice to bring the Gospel. As is the end, so is the method. Like produces like. If the kingdom of righteousness

The Kingdom and the Father

peace and joy in the Holy Ghost is to be founded, it cannot be founded by injustice and war, and the infliction of sorrow and misery on the innocent such as inevitably accompanies war. So Jesus Christ put aside this temptation. When will His Church learn to follow Him in this?

But if as Messiah He was not to be a conquering king, what was He to be? The other Messianic hope at once came to His mind; the heavenly Son of Man of the apocalyptists. As we know, to the very end He expected to come again as "The Son of Man on the clouds of heaven." This expectation, then, was not put aside as was that of the conquering king; rather it was accepted and cherished. But the practical question at once arose, How was it to be accomplished? He was not on the clouds of heaven. That position could only be attained by supernatural means. But perhaps it was intended that He should Himself take steps to bring supernatural forces to work. There was an assurance in the Psalms that seemed exactly to fit the circumstances. It was said to the man that had perfect confidence in God that the angels would be commanded to bear him in their hands to prevent any harm happening to him (Ps. xci. 11). Let Him then test this. He would jump from a corner of the Temple. God would care for Him. He would be borne slowly and gently to earth "on the clouds of heaven" apparently—really on the hands of angels. Thus would He inaugurate the Messianic reign.¹

But again He recognised the temptation. Again He repelled it: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Had God intended Him at once to be the

¹ The writer is indebted for this interpretation of the third temptation to the work already referred to by William Temple.

Christ and War

heavenly Messiah He would have so revealed Him. But God had made Him a man ; therefore as a man there was work for Him to do. To doubt this, to attempt to hasten the Divine purposes, would be to destroy God's plan—to tempt God.

Jesus Christ came through the Temptation scatheless because He had supreme trust in His Father, a trust which the Temptation only served to strengthen.

If now we return to our question, Why did He not proclaim Himself as Messiah ? we are in a position to give two answers :—

(i) His contemporaries would have understood it as a call to arms to throw off the Roman yoke. A human Messiah must be a conquering king.

(ii) He could not explain to others at the beginning what form His Messiahship would take, *because He did not know*. He knew that He was not to be a conquering king ; He knew that He must not use His power for His own ends ; He knew that He must not attempt to force the hands of the Almighty. His work was to trust and wait day by day for the guidance that would come.

The story of the Temptation then throws light on the reason why Jesus did not early in His ministry explicitly claim to be the Messiah ; but it does more, it reveals to us something of the way in which Jesus Himself regarded His work. It reveals to us the spirit which dominated His whole conception of the Kingdom of God.

Each temptation displays a side of the popular thought of the Kingdom which Jesus denies. Was its essence generally thought to consist in material prosperity—abundance to eat and drink ? Jesus found that that was of secondary importance. The first thing was the spiritual, the word of God. Was it to be gained by force of arms ? Jesus realised

The Kingdom and the Father

that reliance on arms was worship of the devil. Was it to come by Divine interposition—by a miracle of no ethical content? Jesus saw that such an expectation was dishonouring to God.

One of these suggestions which Jesus repudiated bears directly on our subject. He decided once for all for Himself that the Kingdom must not be sought by war. But the lessons of the other temptations point in the same direction. Means external to the moral life, be they miracle or supernatural interference, do not avail to alter the lives of men. He who could marvellously supply His own wants and theirs might be followed by a gaping crowd. He who could come on the clouds of heaven might cause a nine days' wonder. But to alter men, to make them fit to be citizens of the Kingdom, an inward change is needed; this change can only come through trust in God and obedience to Him. *Trust in God and obedience to Him not only are necessary preconditions for the Kingdom—they are the Kingdom. When all men trust God and obey Him the Kingdom will have come.* But the attitude of trust in God and obedience to Him requires as its true complement an attitude of love and trust towards our fellows. In short, the Kingdom is a moral kingdom and can only come by moral means.

At once the thought that violence and war, which let loose anger and malice, can be of service in its advancement is seen to be false. There are those who say, "one should love the Kingdom of God enough to fight for it." If by this is meant fight in the literal sense it shows an entire misconception of the Kingdom. One cannot fight for it, one can only fight against it.

If, then, we cannot advance the Kingdom by war, war cannot be allowed to the Christian under any circumstances, for, as has been already pointed out,

Christ and War

according to the teaching of Jesus the Kingdom is the one supreme object of desire for the Christian, and other objects are only legitimate in so far as they are contained in it.

That this attitude which we have seen is indicated by the story of the Temptation is also abundantly supported by the teaching and practice of Jesus I propose now to show.

TEACHING ABOUT THE KINGDOM

There are certain passages which indicate that Jesus Christ, while undoubtedly looking for a great consummation of the Kingdom in the future, regarded it as in some sense present even in His own lifetime amongst His disciples.

(a) The Kingdom is spoken of as already here. In our Lord's first preaching of the Kingdom Mark records that He said "the Kingdom of God is at hand" (i. 15). Here the word translated "is at hand" is a perfect (*ἤγγικεν*), and might perhaps be more adequately rendered "has already come near"—that is, He regards the Kingdom as present. Three other passages in the Gospels state the same thing. On the return of the Seventy from their mission, reporting success beyond their expectations, Luke records that Jesus said "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (x. 18)—that is, already the power of the enemy is being destroyed: the Kingdom is already here and conquering.

A little later (Luke xi. 20; see also Matt. xii. 28), *apropos* of His power over evil spirits, Jesus says, "If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you." We might translate "overtaken you." The power of Jesus Christ over the forces of evil proves that the Kingdom is already present.

Lastly, and most often quoted, is the passage

The Kingdom and the Father

Luke xvii. 20, 21, where the Pharisees, who expected the catastrophic coming of the Kingdom, asked when it would come, and He replied, "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say Lo, here! or there! for, behold, the Kingdom of God is within you."

It is a doubtful point whether "within you" or "amongst you" more adequately represents the Greek (*ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*), but in either case it is clear that Jesus discourages any hope of seeing a great catastrophe, whether caused by man through revolution, or by God through Divine interposition. Those who hope for the Kingdom are rather to look for it in the unobserved things within or around them. For it is already there.

(b) There are a number of parables which also point to the Kingdom as a growing organism,¹ already in the world, developing until its perfection is come.

Thus the parable of the sower seems intended to indicate that Jesus in His preaching, perhaps also in His life and death, sows in men the seeds of a new life—a new attitude to God—which does not at once attain to its full development, but grows like the growth of corn, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear," until at length, when it is fully matured, the consummation, the harvest, comes (Mark iv. 1—20; compare also Mark iv. 26—29, 30—32, and Luke xiii. 21).

Mark iv. 10—12 indicates that the teaching in these parables was unexpected and not at first understood, even by the disciples. This surely must be accounted for by the fact that it repre-

¹ It is not intended to imply that the Kingdom grows without any effort on man's part. It requires our active co-operation. As God works in, we are to work out (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

Christ and War

sented a view of the Kingdom very different from any that was current at that time. Revolution or Divine interposition were the two possible thoughts for men of our Lord's day. In these parables He emphasises neither. Revolution is never thought of here or elsewhere in His teaching, and in these parables Divine interposition, instead of being ushered in by terrible calamities, is simply in the course of nature—is as natural as reaping a harvest field or baking bread.

This great fact of Christ's teaching that the Kingdom is already in the world has been generally accepted by the Christian Church, yet there is a necessary corollary which has not by any means always been drawn. It is this: *The citizens of the Kingdom must in their lives express what is the essence of the Kingdom.* No doubt existed in our Lord's time that righteousness and peace were of its essence, the only doubt was what the method of its coming was to be. For all Christians Jesus has settled that question, for :—

(i) He taught that the Kingdom is already here. Therefore its specific qualities are now to be expressed in its citizens.

(ii) In His temptation we see Him definitely declining to take the way of war to establish the Kingdom.

Therefore His followers must refuse to participate in war and do all in their power to spread peace in the earth. A study of the teaching of Jesus generally cannot fail to confirm this conclusion. For example, in the beatitudes the Kingdom belongs to the poor in spirit, that is, the humble ; and the peacemakers, not the warriors, are the sons of God. The rest of the Sermon on the Mount also (Matt. v.—vii.) is full of sayings which emphatically declare the peaceful character required of citizens of the Kingdom. Anger and revenge are forbidden and love to enemies

The Kingdom and the Father

is enjoined (Matt. v. 22, 39, 44). Thus the very roots of war are to be removed. Is it possible that Jesus would tolerate the branches?

Not in vain in the early part of that sermon do the words occur, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."¹ No half-hearted acceptance of Christ's commands will avail to bring peace to the individual—the inward, present kingdom—much less can it avail to bring the consummation when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the Kingdom of God and of Christ. Christ demands of His followers a complete devotion which, as is over and over again stated in the Sermon on the Mount, goes to the very roots of conduct within.

THE PRACTICE OF JESUS

Not only in the teaching of Jesus are there clear indications that in His view the methods of war are opposed to His Kingdom, in His life and death we see the same principle in action.

We find no better summary of the work of our Lord during His ministry than the answer He sent to John the Baptist (Matt. xi. 4—6; Luke vii. 22, 23) when the latter asked if He really was the Messiah. "Tell John the things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the good tidings preached unto them. And blessed is he whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me." This answer of Jesus is remarkable. He does not explicitly claim the Messiahship, yet He implies that He is the Messiah; and allows at the same time that the great difference between the fact and the expectation

¹ Matt. v. 20.

Christ and War

might cause offence to some. A Messiah whose life consisted mainly in doing kindnesses in helping and healing, whose preaching was not the Day of Judgment, but a message of hope and joy, was very different from what any section of the Jews expected. Yet this expresses what was His own view of His work at first, when He sowed the seed of the Kingdom, when He first brought it close to His people. But it is not a complete view of His work. As time went on and the appeal of pure love and inward righteousness was rejected, another and terrible part of His work became clear. It is possible that it was only "in the things that He suffered"—the rebuffs and opposition—that He learned how His work would end. In any case, only in the latter part of His ministry, when Galilee seemed closed to Him, and He went with His disciples into the Gentile regions of Cæsarea Philippi (Mark viii. 27 ff.), did He open His secret to them. Peter had recognised Him as the long-expected Messiah, but apparently had not realised of what sort His Messiahship was to be. Perhaps he had thought that their journey through Gentile country was preparatory to the call to arms to put the Son of David on the throne. For Jesus "charged them that they should tell no man," as though He feared that now the disciples would endeavour to make Him king; and He at once went on to explain how His work as Messiah was to be accomplished, not by conquest, not by all men flocking to Him, but by rejection, suffering, death (viii. 31). This was God's way for His Son, not man's, as our Lord's answer to Peter's rebuke indicates (viii. 33), and not only for the Son as unique, but as the example to be followed by all who will be His disciples. They, too, are to expect death, to carry the instrument for their own execution, because the way to true life for them and for all men may lie

The Kingdom and the Father

through death (viii. 34—37). Twice again did Jesus Christ impress upon His disciples how His life would end (Mark ix. 30—32, x. 32—34). But it was so entirely contrary to all their expectations that they could not take it literally, and when His death came it came as a blight on all their hopes (see especially Luke xxiv. 21).

The result of the Temptation had been largely negative. The Kingdom and the Messiahship were not to possess certain characteristics which were generally expected. The one positive gain of the Temptation, a deepened trust in God through popularity, opposition and disappointment, had led Jesus Christ to combine two ideas which appear never before to have been applied to the same person. He found in the latter chapters of Isaiah a portrayal of the method of His Messiahship. The Messiah was to be no conquering king, but the Suffering Servant of Jehovah. He was destined, indeed, to conquer all men and gain a universal kingdom, but His conquest was to be the conquest of might by suffering, the conquest of hate by love.

Gethsemane and the cross are the necessary sequel to the Temptation. Jesus Christ not only refused to take the obvious way, which appeared certain to succeed—He deliberately took the path which appeared to end only in failure. Viewed as the world views things, His life was one of brilliant promise cut short in its prime without accomplishing anything. Judged by the world's standards, *He failed utterly*. Yet He lives and reigns in the hearts of thousands, while *the apparently great and powerful who compassed His death are known to history only because of their connection with Him*. As the centuries go by it becomes more and more clear that He has conquered. Violence has over-reached itself; strength has failed. "The weakness of God

Christ and War

is stronger than men." Though Christ crucified is still a "scandal" and "foolishness" to many, history has shown Him to be "the power of God and the wisdom of God."

Our Lord's deliberate statement of the contrast between the way of the kingdoms of the world and the way of His Kingdom is worth pondering —

"Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your servant: and whosoever would be first shall be slave of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mark x. 42—45) (R.V. slightly altered to bring out the true force of the Greek).

Here there is an entire upsetting of the world's standard of values, applied *not only exceptionally in His own case, but generally for all His followers.*

Jesus Christ calls us to follow Him in His suffering and death; this is not compatible with the waging of war, even in the cause of justice or in self-defence. He deliberately refused to do either.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

The second great conception of Jesus Christ, the Fatherhood of God, carries us deeper into His thought of God than does the idea of God's Kingdom, for it is much more intimate and personal, and, indeed, the latter conception is dominated by it, as is stated almost in so many words in Luke xii. 32, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom," and in the Lord's Prayer, where we are told to beseech "Our Father" that His Kingdom may come. The Kingdom is not the kingdom of a

The Kingdom and the Father

distant and inaccessible Cæsar hundreds of miles away, but the Kingdom of the Father, who is near to everyone and can be addressed at any time by any of His children, for He cares for each one.

There are three features of our Lord's teaching on this subject which are important for our discussion.

I. There is first of all the very obvious deduction : if God is Father of all men, all men are brothers and are bound to behave in a brotherly way to one another. Jesus Christ nowhere explicitly says this, for the root of men's relationship to one another is found in their relationship to God, and it is of the latter that He constantly speaks. Yet it is implicit in much of His teaching, and one or two well-known passages show the stress which He always laid on the behaviour of man to man.

Of these the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x. 25—37) is the most familiar. A lawyer, it will be remembered, was discussing with our Lord the fundamentals of religion, and gave it as his opinion that the most important commands in the law were those which enjoined love to God and love to the neighbour. Our Lord heartily concurred in this judgment (see also Mark xii. 29, 30). But notice how this answer to the question, Who is my neighbour ? shows an advance on current standards.

To the Jew, neighbour and brother were practically synonymous terms ; for both meant a fellow Jew, one of his own race. The pious Jew believed that it was his duty next in importance to his devotion to God to love those of his own nation, but towards foreigners no such duty was recognised.

Now, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus so extends the meaning of the term "neighbour" that it embraces every man, regardless of racial barriers. The one whose action is here held up as typically neighbourly towards the man in distress is

Christ and War

a member not only of another race, but of a race for whom a very special enmity was entertained. The Samaritan was not simply a potential enemy, as was every foreigner, but as a descendant of renegade Israelites he was supposed especially to stand under the wrath of God, and was therefore a fit subject for the hatred of God's people.

The meaning, then, of the parable is this :—

Brotherhood is not confined to those of the same race *or* to those of the same religion. It embraces *all* men. You have a duty as neighbour to everyone who needs your help and whom you can help.

Further, it should be noticed that Jesus chooses an extreme case to teach this wider brotherhood. It was the Samaritan in the parable who acted as neighbour to the Jew. The Samaritans might, and no doubt did, hate the Jews, as we see from Luke ix. 52, 53. But it was the Jews who began the enmity and who, as the stronger party, were oppressive and cruel.

Our Lord's teaching here, then, has a very special bearing on the attitude of the Christian towards war. He shows that His follower must regard as neighbour, as brother, the man of another race, of another religion, the enemy who hates him, *even when that hatred is gratuitous and undeserved*. The disciple of Jesus is to be ready at every opportunity to do good to such an enemy and heartily to love him.

It is precisely the same extension of the meaning of neighbour which is taught in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 43, 44), where our Lord contrasts His law of universal love with the probably unwritten addition to the commandment of love to the neighbour that one might hate one's enemy.

We may find it hard to love our enemies, but on no possible exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount or of the parable of the Good Samaritan can we escape

The Kingdom and the Father

the conclusion that Jesus intended His disciples to do so. He uses metaphor and simile freely in His teaching, but here there is no trace of either. The words must have either their face value or they are meaningless.

In teaching the brotherhood of man, which is to show itself in mutual love, our Lord is only asking His followers to act as He acted. For, whether we look at His kindness to the poor and suffering, or at His willingness to associate without appearance of condescension with publicans and sinners, or at His death for us, we see Him acting as brother to men. His life led Him to the cross—in other words, ended in apparent failure. If, then, our attempts to obey His commands should appear certain to result in failure, death to the individual or destruction to the nation, we dare not delude ourselves by thinking that such sacrifices are not required of us.¹

“ O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee;
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.”

II. The second lesson we are to learn out of our Lord's teaching about the Fatherhood of God is that *the character of the Father is to be reproduced in the children*. This is most clearly expressed in Luke vi. 27—36, where it is made the foundation of the teaching about love to enemies, forgiveness, liberality and universal kindness. For our purpose the summing up in the last two verses of the section is of most importance. It reads as follows:—

“ But love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing (margin R.V., “despairing

¹ The writer does not believe that disarmament would bring such disasters upon us. See latter part of Chapter IV. and latter part of Chapter VIII.

Christ and War

of no man "); and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the sons of the Most High: for He is kind toward the unthankful and evil. Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful."

The tremendous import of this teaching cannot be exaggerated. Jesus deliberately sets up the Almighty as the standard of conduct for ordinary human beings. He, the Most High, is kind and forbearing. The argument is from the greater to the less. God, who knows all and cannot err, loves those who really are evil. On the strength of this we, who may be greatly mistaken in our estimate of others, are asked to love our enemies, people who are possibly no more evil than we are ourselves.

It is well for us to remind ourselves that at the present time no civilised nation really thinks that its enemies are the enemies of God, who, because of their sins, must be wiped off the face of the earth. During the period of wars of religion the great majority of Christians, Catholic and Protestant, honestly believed this. They had therefore from a Christian point of view far more excuse for going to war than anyone can have at the present time. Yet the words we are considering show that even their wars arose from a cause which Jesus Christ condemns.

But it may be objected, Does there not come a time when no means but force is of any avail to bring people to reason? To this it may be answered, that in the case of international disagreements which lead to war the unwillingness to reason is seldom confined to one side. And by showing a conciliatory and reasonable spirit one party may do much to bring about a peaceful settlement, even when the other party displays unusual stupidity. But such an answer, though true, does not go to the root of the question, for the real fact of the matter is that

The Kingdom and the Father

force, when used, does not avail to make the stupid party reasonable, but only to give the stronger party the upper hand, so that its will, however unreasonable, can be forced upon the weaker party. War never decides a dispute. It only delays the decision. Hence any settlement gained by war is unstable. The enormous armaments of Europe, and the constant uneasiness, which have had a large part in bringing about the present war, are said to be directly traceable to the "settlement" brought about by the Franco-Prussian war.

In place of this method of settlement Jesus Christ suggests another: "Love your enemies, do them good . . . despairing of no man" (R.V., margin). This is given to us as a command, because it is an essential feature of God's treatment of men. Are not most of the attempts to use force really counsels of despair? We do not believe that the man in question is open to reason, nor to religious feeling, nor to charitable impulse; but our Father despairs of no one; He is kind to the unthankful and evil in order to bring them to the right way. And it is as we enter into this same spirit of kindness to the unthankful and the evil, despairing of no one, but believing that there are possibilities of good in each one, that everyone has something of the Divine in him, which can awaken to the touch of the Divine without him, that we shall be carrying out the work of God in the world.

We learn from the verses immediately preceding those quoted that Jesus expects more of His disciples than of the ordinary "man of the world" who does decently by his friends (Luke vi. 32, 33). But on the war question the Christian Church has as a whole been content to occupy a frankly worldly position, thinking of expediency and gain rather than of her Master.

Christ and War

If we Christians dared to follow Christ in His trust in men, loving the opposers, praying for the oppressors, never despairing, then indeed we might see a revival of true religion; the unbeliever and scoffer would be not only silenced but converted, and the Kingdom would come with power.

III. We do not dare, because we do not trust. But Jesus taught that implicit obedience to God and trust in Him would have its reward and we should receive from Him all things that are necessary for our life. For He is our Father whose good pleasure it is to give us all that we need (see especially Luke xii. 1—40). The ideal set before us by Jesus Christ is high, but that must neither be a cause for despair nor a reason for lowering the standard. For Jesus Christ did not set before us the ideal without Himself making it real in His own life. And the power by which He lived is at the disposal of every one of His followers. *We are not expected to live the Christian life without the Christian power.* Our Father cares for us and will work in us and through us, provided we trust in Him and obey Him. *The spirit of Jesus is able to transform the world, but it cannot do this while the people through whom it ought to work, the followers of Christ, acquiesce in a lower ideal than that which He showed us.*

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

The New Testament passages quoted, especially

Luke iv. 1—13.

Mark viii. 27—38.

Mark x. 35—45.

Luke vi. 20—49.

Dymond's "Essay on War."

CHAPTER III

MEMBERS OF THE BODY

WE have already seen from our study of the teaching and practice of Jesus Christ that the principles of conduct which He expressed cut away for His followers the roots from which war springs. Not only are they incompatible with aggressive warfare, which few would deny, but they are inconsistent even with the defence of life and property.

Knowing as we do that the Christian Church as a whole has by no means always set itself in opposition to war, we are compelled to ask the question, Has the general body of Christian opinion at any time been strongly against all participation in war?

And in answer the present chapter will show :—

(i) That the earliest followers of Christ whose teaching is preserved, the New Testament writers—and especially the Apostle Paul, whose influence has been most strongly felt—emphatically reaffirm those fundamental principles of conduct which He expressed, applying them in such a way that we may be sure they would have forbidden their converts to participate in war, had such a thing ever occurred to them.

(ii) That at a later time, during the first three Christian centuries, the general opinion of the Church was against Christians serving in the army and that, though towards the end of the period many Christians did serve, their action in this matter was the cause of much disquiet in the Church and raised strong protests from prominent ecclesiastical writers.

Christ and War

I. In dealing with the apostolic attitude towards participation in war it is necessary for us to bear three facts in mind.

(a) That the question of Christians participating in war could not have come up at all acutely, because military service was not compulsory in the Roman Empire, and could be easily avoided by those who wished to escape it ; for compared with the number of the population the army was small.

(b) That almost all the New Testament books are occasional writings called forth by special circumstances, and dealing with matters of conduct only as questions arose about them.

(c) That the apostolic writers were not concerned to set up a system of laws ; they regarded Christianity as the religion of the Spirit which guides men from within. They endeavoured, therefore, to cause the Spirit of Christ to permeate the lives of their converts rather than to formulate rules for their guidance.

It follows from these facts that we need not expect to find in the New Testament any direct commands on the subject of war. But we may find principles which, logically applied, show what attitude would have been taken towards the subject, if it had been a practical question in those days. And it is for these we must look.

It will be well first to discuss shortly those passages which have been sometimes quoted to show that the apostles countenanced war.

(a) We are not told that Cornelius was ordered to give up his profession (Acts x.). We discussed the same objection with regard to our Lord's dealings with soldiers in Chapter I. What was said there applies with equal force here.

(b) In Romans xiii. 4, "He beareth not the sword in vain." The sword is not referred to here as a

Members of the Body

weapon of war, but as one of the insignia of magisterial authority. If it be objected that obedience to the rulers is commanded and that a ruler might order a Christian to take up arms, we answer, firstly, that there is no sign that St. Paul contemplated any such possibility, and, secondly, that rulers at a later date frequently commanded Christians to renounce Christ, and it is inconceivable that St. Paul could have recommended obedience in such circumstances. Therefore it is clear that he cannot mean unconditional obedience. So we are not at liberty to use these words as a justification of the practice of war, unless we find such a justification clearly implied elsewhere in St. Paul's teaching.

(c) Some of the heroes in Hebrews xi. are held up as examples of faith on account of their warlike deeds. We are told they "subdued kingdoms," "waxed mighty in war, turned to flight armies of aliens" (Heb. xi. 33, 34).

But it is not the fact that they, some of them, were warriors, which the writer holds up as worthy of imitation, but their faith in God expressed in endurance. The subject of the whole epistle is the superiority of the new covenant to the old. Both religiously and morally the Old Testament sets a lower standard than does Christ, and it appears that the writer even fears that his readers may sink back to this lower standard.¹ Hence, when he has gone through the list of the faithful he turns to the present duty of Christians, which is to run the race set before them, looking to Jesus, who is to be their example, because of His endurance of the cross (xii. 1—4).

That is, he regards the example of Jesus as the one absolute standard of faith and conduct. The only passage in Hebrews which appears to have

¹ See Heb. i. 1, 2 with ii. 1, 2, 3, vi. 4—8, x. 26 ff., &c.

Christ and War

any direct bearing on war is the writer's recommendation to "follow after peace with all men" (xii. 14), and that points in quite the other direction.

(d) The use of military metaphors, not infrequent in the New Testament, has been held to imply that the writers approved of war. The use of such by Christ has been dealt with in Chapter I., and what was said there applies also here. But it is well to discuss a little more fully two cases where the Christian life is compared to that of a soldier, because they have a bearing on our subject.

Ephesians vi. 10—20: the Christian's armour. In this passage, where the apostle uses many military terms and applies them to the Christian's fight against sin, it is expressly stated that "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood." It appears, then, not only that the apostle intended no justification of war, but that he desired expressly to turn away the thoughts of his readers from the outward to the inward struggle which is the real battlefield of the Christian.

2 Tim. ii. 3, 4: "Suffer hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No soldier on service entangleth himself with the affairs of life; that he may please him who enrolled him as a soldier."

Here no justification of military life for the Christian can be intended, for the all-absorbing nature of the service of Christ is emphatically stated. Just as the soldier owes his officer implicit obedience, so the Christian owes implicit obedience to Jesus Christ. If engrossment in the ordinary affairs of life interferes with this implicit obedience, how much more will an implicit obedience owed to a military superior.¹ This passage is of peculiar interest, because it contains the first suggestion of

¹ This subject of Implicit Obedience is further discussed in Chapter VII. in connection with conscription.

Members of the Body

an idea expressed by several of the Fathers that the obedience owed to Christ makes any other absolute obedience impossible.

In neither of these cases is there reason to suppose that the apostle had any thought of Christians taking part in war. Both are references to the spiritual and missionary conflict in which the follower of Christ is constantly engaged. Both are exhortations to concentrate all efforts on that.

II. We now come to certain passages which show that if the question of the permissibility of war for Christians had ever come up in those days, the answer of the New Testament writers would have been in the negative.

(a) James iv. 1, 2: "Whence come wars and whence come fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your pleasures that war in your members? Ye lust and have not: ye kill and cannot obtain: ye fight and war." The writer here does not in so many words forbid war, he rather states very clearly what its causes are. What results from such passions cannot itself be right. It may be objected that a man may take part in war without encouraging in himself any such evil passions. A deep sense of duty may impel him to fight for his country. Can it then be said that his action, or the cause of it is un-Christian? It is certainly quite possible that a high-minded and truly Christian man may act thus, for many have done so. They have not been filled with the evil passions here mentioned, yet in fighting for their country they have made themselves the instruments by means of which such passions find their expression. For it cannot be denied that in national as in individual quarrels passions such as James mentions are always present on both sides. Without them the quarrel assuredly would not develop into

Christ and War

war, and could in fact scarcely even begin. The underlying meaning of these verses was well brought out by George Fox¹ when he was invited to become an officer in the Parliament army (*circa* 1650): "I told them I knew from whence all wars arose, even from lust according to James's doctrine; and that *I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars*" . . . "I told them I was come into the covenant of peace, which was before wars and strifes were." Fox's seems to be the true exegesis. Strife and war spring from something which is contrary to the spirit in which the Christian lives. Therefore, in so far as he is a follower of Christ, he cannot take part in them.

(b) In Romans xii. and xiii., where St. Paul is dealing with practical questions of conduct, there are several verses which are as obviously opposed to the spirit of war as anything in the New Testament. For our purpose the most important are xii. 17—21 and xiii. 8. They read as follows:—

"Render no man evil for evil. Take thought for things honourable in the sight of all men. If it be possible as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men. Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place to wrath; for it is written: vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord. But if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good."

"Owe no man anything, save to love one another: for he that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law."

The conduct here recommended is simply the working out of the supreme law of love, and that

¹"Journal," 8th edition, Vol. I., p. 69.

Members of the Body

even where the reverse of love has been shown to us.

Do men wrong us? We are not to return that wrong. As far as we are concerned ($\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\grave{\xi}\ \upsilon\mu\omega\nu$) we are to live at peace with all men.

But for a perfect state of peace there must be love on both sides. This one party alone can never guarantee. Therefore the apostle says "as much as in you lieth" ($\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\grave{\xi}\ \upsilon\mu\omega\nu$). Those who hate or oppose us may harass and persecute us and attempt to pick a quarrel. We are not to retaliate, "to render evil for evil." Nor are we to wait a suitable opportunity and avenge ourselves upon them; that is not man's place. God alone is judge and avenger. Any attempt to act as judges in our own case is usurping the authority of God. Is then our attitude towards our enemies to be purely passive, resignedly suffering their unkindness? No! the spirit of Christ is always active for good. Our duty as His followers is at every opportunity to show kindness to those who hate us. Evil is to be overcome (that was the purpose of Christ's coming), but it is to be overcome with good.

III. The context of this passage in Romans xii. lends further weight to our argument, for it shows that this moral teaching of the apostle is based on the most central idea in his theology, and the deepest fact of his religious experience: the union of the Christian with Christ.

We must now give some attention to this subject. The Christian dies with Christ and rises into new life with Him (Rom. vi., Gal. ii. 19—21, Col. iii. 1—17). He is henceforth a member of Christ's body (Rom. xii., 1 Cor. xii., xiii., and xiv., Eph. iv. 1—32). He is then to walk in the Spirit (Gal. v. 16—26), to have the mind of Christ (Phil. ii. 1—18).

It may be said that this is a mystical doctrine of

Christ and War

interest to theologians and students of religious psychology, but far away from practical life. What bearing can it have on ordinary conduct, especially on international relations? We answer: The apostle was not given to mystical speculation for its own sake; there is no place in his epistles in which such mystical doctrine is introduced without being applied to the practical problems and difficulties of every-day life. This mystical union with Christ was a real fact in his experience. It had transformed his life. It was Christ in him who had conquered evil and brought unity out of discord. He was therefore bound to pass on to others what he had himself received, and nothing but mystical language is adequate for the task. We shall find in almost all the passages mentioned practical applications which have a distinct bearing on the subject of war, though this was not an urgent question in his day, and is not alluded to in so many words.

We may conveniently discuss the subject under three heads:—

(i) Union with Christ in His death and resurrection.

(ii) Union with Christ as members of His body.

(iii) Union with Christ as thinking His thoughts.

(i) The Union of Christians with Christ in His death and resurrection.

The two chief passages in which Paul teaches this are Romans vi., where special emphasis is laid on the death of Christ, and Colossians iii., where special emphasis is laid on His resurrection.

Romans vi. In verses 1—11 the apostle shows that the Christian is crucified and buried with Christ, and in consequence has died to sin. He is no longer in bondage to sin, and ideally is entirely free from it. Actually, however, this is not the case

Members of the Body

without his own active co-operation. The work of Christ does not itself miraculously transform a man, but it puts him into a position where by receiving the Divine life into him he may be transformed. It is therefore necessary for the apostle to urge Christians to make real this freedom from sin which ought to be theirs. This he does in verses 12 and following: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof."

If we inquire what the lusts here mentioned are we receive no information from this chapter, but turning to Galatians, an epistle written probably about the same time and dealing with the same subjects, we find a passage (v. 16—26) which deals very fully with the lusts that the Christian must conquer and the virtues which, as united with Christ, he is bound to cultivate. It is not necessary to quote the whole passage, but we must notice that prominent amongst the "lusts" which unfit a man for the Kingdom of God (iv. 21) are "enmities, strifes, jealousies, wraths, factions." These are the passions which under appropriate circumstances lead to war, and without which war is impossible. On the other hand are the fruits of the Spirit, that is, the virtues which naturally develop in the man who has died and risen again with Christ—"love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control"—and these are the opposites of the war spirit. Love, peace, and meekness are certainly not amongst the virtues developed in war. And if it be suggested that longsuffering and self-control are necessitated by the trials and privations of campaign, we have to remember that the excesses which always accompany even civilised warfare prove an absence of such qualities at the very time when they are most needed.

Christ and War

But when we turn from the actual fighters to the people who are responsible for making war, the ministers who conduct negotiations or the common people who cry out for war, the absence of these Christian virtues and the prevalence of those passions which Paul condemns are even more marked. Could a modern war between civilised nations take place at all if meekness and a sincere desire for peace were present in those who carried on negotiations? Could a people be induced to go to war without exciting in them jealousy and anger towards the intended enemy? Is the whole state of strain between two nations that must precede war, the vituperation, the imputation of low motives, the unwillingness to decide except by war, in the least compatible with love? Nor is it only nations as nations who cast aside the law of Christ at such times; many an individual Christian expresses what cannot be truly called anything but hatred of the enemy.

When St. Paul said that sin and its lusts are not to reign he meant that, amongst others, these passions which lead to war are to be dethroned and that the virtues which are their opposites are to take their place.

The same thought is given again in Colossians iii. 8, where we are told because we died with Christ and have risen with Him we are to put off "anger, wrath, malice," and are to come into a position where all men, without distinction of race, are one in Christ (v. 11). This unity of the body of Christ (v. 15) is to be completed by mutual love (v. 14), which is the summing up of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, longsuffering, forbearance, and forgiveness.

If Christian people earnestly sought to let the apostle's teaching influence the whole of their lives,

Members of the Body

could they participate in or countenance war, even if waged in a just cause? Would they not rather suffer wrong?

(ii) The union of Christians with Christ as fellow members of His body (Rom. xii., 1 Cor. xii., xiii., xiv.; compare also Eph. iv. and passage already referred to, Col. iii. 12—17).

While under our first head we considered how the Christian as an individual is united to Christ, and from that inferred the Christian morality, under our present head we consider him as united not only to Christ, but to his fellow-Christians. He is a part of the body of Christ. If, then, he entertain enmity towards other Christians, the unity of Christ's body is destroyed. A chief factor in transforming a legitimate difference of opinion into a bitter quarrel is too exalted an opinion of oneself. The apostle, therefore, in Rom. xii. 3 begs his friends not to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think, but to think soberly, realising that not only they, but other men too, have been given a measure of faith. The body of Christ is not composed of members that are all alike. A living organism contains unity in diversity (*v.* 4—8). Each member has his place and function, but all must be bound together in love. Instead of each thinking most highly of himself and desiring the best for himself, love will lead him to desire most for other people (*v.* 9, 10). The working out in action of this principle of love is next dealt with, in the first case towards fellow-believers (*v.* 11—13), but afterwards (as we have already seen, p. 59) to non-Christians and persecutors (*v.* 14—21).

The same thought of the body of Christ appears again in 1 Cor. xii.—xiv., where, as a corrective to certain disintegrating tendencies at work in the Corinthian Church, it is much more fully elaborated

Christ and War

The line of argument is as follows :—

In so far as we are Christians, we are members of the body of Christ, and this quite irrespective of race. Were the Jew and Greek, as exponents of opposite ideals of life, natural enemies? As Christians they were fellow-members of Christ's body (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13). And the different types of thought, the different sorts of workers, are all necessary to that body (v. 14—20). None can do without the rest; no one member is of most importance; even the feeble are necessary (v. 21—25). The honour or dishonour of one is the honour or dishonour of all, for they are organically one (v. 26). The apostle at this point applies what he has said to the particular problems of the Corinthian Church, which are not, for our purpose, of primary importance (v. 27—31). And then he breaks into the Hymn of Love in ch. xiii. No matter what place I fill in the Church (the body of Christ), no matter what my gifts and abilities, no matter what my good deeds, one thing alone can make me of any value—Love! (xiii. 1—3). Why? Because knowledge, abilities, and good deeds may all tend only to separate me from my fellows—Love unites. So we notice in the following verses (v. 4—7), the relationship of the one who loves to other people is emphasised. "Love suffereth long, and is kind." Why? Because it considers other people, and would rather suffer itself than that they should suffer. So love is not jealous, haughty or proud; it does not behave rudely, nor think only of its own gain; it is not irritable, nor does it keep a ledger account for injuries. Its joy is not found in injustice, but in truth. Having thus rejected the common way of life, by which the natural man expects to gain his rights, love takes the opposite way. It bears all that its enemies may do to it; for it continues to

Members of the Body

believe that there is good in them, and still hopes for them, patient to the end. And the consequence of this is that love is successful. Other things that make a greater show in the world disappear, their usefulness comes to an end, and they are forgotten as childish toys are forgotten by the grown-up man. Love lasts because it is more real, more in accord with the central reality of the world than anything else (v. 8—13). The apostle closes with the words "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." They abide because they are the bonds by which man is bound to God and to his fellow-man. And love is the greatest because it can reinforce the others when they grow weak, and because it is the experience on which Faith builds and to which hope looks.

Many Christians feel keenly the division of the Church into sects and parties, and, in so far as these oppose or persecute one another, there is indeed a schism in the body of Christ, and a terrible blot on Christianity. But sects and parties are increasingly coming to realise their real underlying unity. Thus the apostolic ideal of *unity in diversity* is probably nearer to realisation at the present time than for many centuries. Different expression of Christian thought are no longer obstacles to the recognition of fellow-believers and to mutual love and common work for the kingdom. One great barrier¹ to Christian unity now is the enmity often cherished by Christians of one nation towards those of another nation, who are in reality fellow-members of the body of Christ. Splendid individual cases are to be found where Christians show real love to one another even when their countries are at war. At the time of the Russo-Japanese War there were both

¹ The other great barrier, class hatred, must not be overlooked. How far are Christians responsible for that?

Christ and War

Russians and Japanese delegates at a great Salvation Army festival, and they fraternised and forgot their national quarrel in Christian love. No doubt many other such instances could be mentioned. But the fact remains that war between Christian nations causes even the otherwise sincerely Christian members of those nations to forget their unity in the body of Christ and to hate one another. And not only does war do this, the present race of armaments has exactly the same effect, though happily on a smaller scale. In order to induce peoples to spend the enormous sums at present devoted to armies and navies they have to be convinced that other nations intend to attack them. The natural consequence is hatred of the nation supposed to have such intentions. So the unity of the body of Christ is destroyed. For it is the Christian nations who are armed to the teeth ; it is they who are constantly in fear of an attack from Christian neighbours. And the heathen world looks on and thinks that *that* is Christianity. There is a strong tendency at the present time in China to adopt Christianity, yet along with Christianity, which will be an untold blessing to her, she is adopting Western militarism, which may be nothing but a curse.

One objection that the spiritually-minded Hindu has to accepting Christianity is that *Christianity countenances war*.¹

How can the Kingdom of God come while those who should be working for it are divided against one another, not only by differences of opinion which cannot be avoided, but by hatred, which is contrary to the mind of Christ ?

(iii) This brings us naturally to our third head. The Christian is united with Christ as he thinks His thoughts.

¹ Andrews, " Renaissance of India," p. 153.

Members of the Body

This is expressed in a number of passages in Paul's epistles, including Gal. v. 16—26, which we considered in another connection, but the best and fullest expression of it is found in Phil. ii. 1—11.

It appears that in the Philippian Church there were tendencies towards lack of unity and party spirit ; the apostle writes this passage as a corrective to such tendencies, and, as is usual with him, he takes the highest possible ground. He might have argued that party spirit only brings trouble and annoyance ; that discord does not pay ; that commonsense tells us we must have a little mutual forbearance. These are all quite true and to the point, and, *mutatis mutandis*, may be applied to international relations (compare the economic and humanitarian arguments for universal peace). But St. Paul, instead of suggesting such lines of argument, goes back to first principles. You as followers of Christ are to think as He thinks. Phil. ii. 5—11 : " Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus : who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men ; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name ; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This passage is famous in theology as the great proof text of Christian Christology, for in it both the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ are affirmed. And to use it as a proof of Paul's teaching

Christ and War

on the subject is quite legitimate, but by doing so we do not emphasise *the* meaning of *the* text. St. Paul desired here to teach, not Christian dogma, but Christian morality. The great fact to be shown to his reader was not that "Christ was divine," but that "Christ was humble." Thus it is the one final and sufficient answer to the Christian who desires to secure his own rights, who wishes to claim the privileges or honours that really are his. Jesus Christ, who had a right to the highest place in the universe, not only did not grasp at it, but laid it on one side and became a man, and not only a man but a slave. Nor did his humiliation stop there—He suffered death, and that in its most disgraceful form.

But this is not all; it was the humiliation of Christ, His suffering, which led to His exaltation as the head and Lord of a redeemed humanity. And in this fact we see again *that God's way of saving the world is the way of patience and meekness, not that of self-seeking and strife.* We are asked as Christians to co-operate with God in saving mankind. Is not one reason why this work progresses so slowly that many Christians cherish in part of their lives a spirit at variance with the mind of Christ? We have not faith to believe that God's way of saving the world is the only way that can be successful. Missionaries abroad and Christian workers at home all agree in one statement, that the greatest hindrance to the extension of Christ's kingdom is found in the lives of professing Christians. We teach the meekness and gentleness of Christ, yet our behaviour is often haughty and oppressive. We preach the gospel of peace, but arm ourselves in readiness for war.

We have seen how this great Pauline thought of union with Christ in all its three main developments

Members of the Body

is opposed in essence to war. But it must not be overlooked that it is opposed also to much else in our modern civilisation. Heartlessness, oppression and hatred find their expression in war, but not their only expression. If the spirit of Jesus Christ were once again to fill the Church, not only would race hatred and war depart from the Christian world, but class hatred and social injustice would go too. We who are working for universal peace between the nations are at one with those who are working for justice at home.

If space permitted it would be possible to show that in other New Testament writers there is teaching which as definitely cuts at the roots from which war springs as does anything in Paul's epistles.

IV. The attitude of the early Church towards Christians participating in war.

As in the New Testament, so in the earliest sub-apostolic writings that have come down to us, the question of Christians taking part in war or becoming soldiers is never discussed. Roughly speaking we may divide the history of the early Church into three periods in respect of the attitude of Christians to the military profession.

Period I. The primitive Church till about the time of Irenæus (*circa* 200 A.D.).

During this period the Church disapproved of war and Christians were conspicuous by refusing to become soldiers.

Period II. From 200 to about 313.

During this period Church writers protest strongly against Christians being in the army, but some were in it.

Period III. After Constantine (313 onwards).

The Church was allied with the empire, and could no longer maintain her protest against war. Chris-

Christ and War

tians were increasingly to be found in the army, and in general they do not seem to have been severely blamed for it; yet, for a time, an undercurrent of protest is still apparent.

It will be well to look a little at each of these three periods.

Period I. Of this period Harnack says: "At that time in the Christian Churches such a question (*i.e.*, whether a Christian might be a soldier) did not exist."¹ He further points out that we have every reason to suppose that in those days no Christian *became* a soldier, though it is possible that some who were converted when already in the army did not at once leave it, justifying themselves by St. Paul's maxim, "Let each man abide in that calling wherein he was called." Until nearly the end of this period we have no definite evidence of the presence of Christians in the army, and there are passages in the writings of Justin Martyr (*circa* 150) and Irenæus (*circa* 180) which show that Christians in their day were strongly opposed to all war.

Justin in his first "Apology," addressed to the emperor, maintains the peaceful nature of the Christian profession. After quoting Isa. ii. 3, 4, where the prophet foresees in the extension of the worship of Jehovah the promise of perpetual peace, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," he claims that this prophecy is already being fulfilled, because "We [Christians] who formerly used to murder one another, not only *now refrain from making war upon our enemies*, but also, that we may not lie nor deceive our enemies, willingly die confessing Christ" (Justin, "Apology," I. 39).

¹ Harnack, "Militia Christi," p. 47. The book is written in German, and has not been translated.

Members of the Body

Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria also in various passages in their writings imply that Christians do not fight. Clement, who is very fond of military metaphor, speaks of Christians as the "bloodless hosts of peace," "the soldiers of peace," and uses other expressions which show that he regarded peacefulness as characteristic of Christianity.

Celsus, the opponent of Christianity whose attack was answered by Origen, is another witness that in the second century Christians refused military service. He asks what would become of the empire if all its inhabitants were Christians and therefore refused to fight? To this question Origen replies: "We say 'if two of us shall agree on earth touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done by the Father' of the just 'which is in heaven,' for God rejoices in the agreement of rational beings, and turns away from discord, and what are we to expect, if not only a very few agree, as at present, but the whole of the Roman Empire? For they will pray to the Word, who of old said to the Hebrews when they were pursued by the Egyptians, 'The Lord shall fight for you and ye shall hold your peace;' and if they all unite in prayer with one accord, they will be able to put to flight far more enemies than those who were discomfited by the prayer of Moses" (Origen, "Contra Celsum," VIII. 69).

From this answer of Origen it appears that for him, still in the middle of the third century, Christianity and war were incompatible, yet there is clear evidence that during his lifetime the general attitude of the Church on the question had been somewhat weakened. And we may date our second period roughly from 200 A.D.

Period II., 200—313. Though during this time Origen, Tertullian, and other prominent Church

Christ and War

writers protest that military service is impossible for Christians, there is evidence, even in these Fathers' own writings, that Christians were to be found in considerable numbers in the army. This is seen from the fact that Tertullian's treatise, "De Corona," was written to answer the question, Is it right for a Christian, who is a soldier, to wear a military chaplet? In the course of his discussion he freely admits that many Christians were in his day already in the army, though he would have them boldly come out and face the consequences. He gives a number of reasons why a Christian ought not to be a soldier at all, of which the chief are :—

(i) The soldier has to take the military oath of implicit obedience—that is to say, he must take another master besides Christ.

(ii) He must use the sword, take part in battle, and carry out sentences of imprisonment and torture which are all contrary to the law of Christ.

(iii) As a soldier he is even more entangled with idolatry than is the ordinary citizen.

What Tertullian says on the second head is particularly worthy of note. "Shall it be held lawful," he asks, "to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who takes the sword shall perish with the sword? And shall the *son of peace* take part in a battle, when it does not even become him to sue at law? And shall he apply the chain and prison, and torture and punishment, who is not even the avenger of his own wrongs" (Tertullian, "De Corona," II).

In this passage Tertullian bases his reasoning on our Lord's law of forgiveness—Matt. v. 38—42 (which we discussed in Chapter I.).

Two other passages from his writings may also be quoted as showing how absolutely unfitted for a Christian he regarded the profession of arms :—

Members of the Body

" But how will [a Christian] war, nay how will he serve [in the army] in time of peace, without a sword which the Lord has taken away? For, although soldiers had come to John [the Baptist] and had received their instructions [from him] (Luké iii. 14); although likewise, a centurion had believed; *the Lord afterwards in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier* " (" De Idolol.," 19).

" For what wars should we not be fit, should we not be eager, even with unequal forces, we who so willingly yield ourselves to the sword, *if in our religion it were not counted better to be slain than to slay?* " (" Apology," 37).

Period III. When we pass from the third century to the fourth we see a marked alteration in the attitude of the Church towards the military life. While in the third century there may have been a considerable number of Christians in the army, the opinion of the Church generally was against them. In the fourth century less and less objection appears to have been taken to the profession of arms. Nor is the cause far to seek. When Constantine consolidated the empire under his rule, the Church had not been slow to greet this as the conquest of heathenism by Christianity. No longer were Christians a down-trodden and persecuted people to whom the empire and its armies were often hostile; they were the trusted friends of the emperor.

Two objections to the military profession now disappeared :—

(i) The soldier was no longer compelled to take part in heathen worship.

(ii) He was no longer liable to be ordered to slay or torture Christians on account of their religion.

When it is further remembered that Christianity now became popular, and as a consequence was professed by many who were neither deeply spiritual

Christ and War

nor strongly influenced by its moral teaching, it is not surprising that the opposition to the military life was greatly weakened.

One or two Church Fathers still spoke strongly against it (*e.g.*, Lactantius, whose protests are quite as strong as anything we find in Tertullian); and in some districts it appears that the Church still condemned any of its members who became soldiers *from choice*. But as time went on even this protest ceased. For the Church gradually gave up the attempt to make all Christians conform to the Gospel standard of life, and, having allowed a separation to take place between the secular life and the religious, insisted on the highest standards of morality only in the latter. So that, while no participation in war was allowed to priests and monks, no objection was taken to the layman becoming a soldier.

Thus the outward success of Christianity caused inward failure. It had conquered the world, but the conquest was a worldly conquest. The Church now had temporal power, her political influence was great, but she had lost in spiritual power, and her power to transform men's lives was less.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

The New Testament passages quoted, especially Romans xii.

Harnack's "Militia Christi" (in German).

"The Arbiter in Council," last section, "Christianity and War," pp. 507—567.

CHAPTER IV

VOICES IN THE WILDERNESS

IN the last chapter we saw how up to the beginning of the fourth century the most important Fathers of the Church had maintained a protest against Christians taking part in war. From this time onward, though here and there a prominent ecclesiastic voiced a similar protest, Christians generally became increasingly entangled in worldly affairs and began to lose the sense of antagonism between Christ and militarism, which had hitherto restrained them from participation in war. Of course the Church stood for peaceful in preference to warlike methods, as she stood for a milder and more humane standard in every department of life.

An example of the best side of the attitude of the Church at this time is the action of Ulfilas,¹ the apostle to the Goths (fourth century), who, in translating the Bible into Gothic, omitted the books of Samuel and Kings, being of opinion that his converts needed no encouragement towards making war, but rather restraint. The Church discouraged but did not prohibit war, for the sharp antithesis had gone. War might be necessary for the good of the empire and the Church. If it were necessary, the Church could give her blessing upon it and allow her sons to take part in it. But from time to time, amongst sects which sprang up in the Catholic Church but were thrust out of it as heretics, we see the teaching of the Gospel taken literally

¹ Ulfilas was an Arian, but on such ethical questions there was no difference between Orthodox and Arian.

Christ and War

and understood as condemning all war. That the teaching of such sects has left but little trace in the life of Christendom is due to the fact that the Church bitterly persecuted them and used every endeavour to stamp them out.

I. In the Middle Ages several sects arose which seem to have resembled one another in three chief points:—

(i) Their adherents were to be found almost entirely amongst the common people.

(ii) They cared more for the cultivation of the Christian life than for dogma.

(iii) They took the teaching of Jesus very literally.

In consequence of these three peculiarities they seem generally to have had a tendency to minimise the importance of the sacraments and to dispense with the regular priesthood. And it was this tendency which brought them into conflict with the Church, and earned for them the name of heretics and the persecution thereby entailed.

Two of the best known of such sects are of interest to us because they very definitely refused to participate in war.

(i) The earlier of these, the Cathari,¹ a name that we may render "Puritans," seem to have had their origin in Bulgaria about the middle of the ninth century. By the middle of the eleventh century they had spread over a great part of Europe and were known by a great many different names, some, like "Slavoni," being due to their having originally come from a Slav country, others, such as "Weavers," marking the fact that their teaching spread most amongst artisans. Their lives were pure and benevolent. They were hard workers, who were honest and just in their dealings with all men.

¹ R. M. Jones, "Studies in Mystical Religion," p. 134; Neander, "Church History," Vol. VIII., p. 368 ff.

Voices in the Wilderness

Their protest against war seems to have arisen from a literal understanding of the Sermon on the Mount, for they held also that capital punishment was wicked and that oaths were not allowed.

(ii) In the latter part of the twelfth century the Waldenses arose. Possibly they received some of their ideas from the Cathari. Their name is derived from that of their founder, Peter Waldo, a rich Lyons merchant. About the year 1170 he passed through a spiritual crisis. A learned theologian advised him to obey our Lord's words to the Rich Young Ruler (Matt. xix. 21): "If thou wouldest be perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, follow me." Waldo obeyed this teaching, and, like St. Francis, at a later date, began a life of evangelic poverty. He had the Gospels translated into Provençal, and diligently studied them and preached and taught amongst the poor. He soon obtained a large following, mainly from amongst the artisan class. The Waldenses appear to have had no desire to leave the Church, nor did they at first oppose any of its doctrines; but they believed that they, simple laymen as they were, were called to preach, and this brought them into conflict with the priesthood. They, like the Catharists, opposed war and capital punishment, taking literally the command "Thou shalt not kill." They endeavoured to make the Gospels the rule of their lives, and therefore naturally saw the chief fruit of religion in practical goodness. This is seen by the answer which one of their number gave to the inquisitors at Toulouse; when asked what his religion had taught him, his reply was "That he should neither speak nor do evil; that he should do nothing to others that he would not have done to himself; and that he should not lie nor swear."¹

¹ R. M. Jones, "Studies in Mystical Religion," p. 142.

Christ and War

The Franciscan movement of the thirteenth century was in many respects similar to the foregoing. It was an attempt to return to Gospel standards of life and conduct. In one thing, however, it differed from these earlier movements in that it was retained within the Church.

The Franciscan friars rapidly became a great power in Christendom, first of all following the ideal of their founder as preachers, in later times as theologians. But Francis had desires for spiritual religion which could not be fulfilled by those alone who deserted house and property for the sake of the Gospel; he formed also an association of laymen and women who were in the ordinary workaday life of the world to practise the Gospel teaching of love and goodness. These were known as the Tertiaries. Numbers of earnest men and women thronged into the new order, and its effect on international life was widely felt, for its members were forbidden to bear arms at all, and in consequence princes experienced difficulty in waging war.¹

Thus the protest against Christians taking part in war comes up again *within* the Church.

Yet how little influence such peace ideals had on the Church as a whole may be gathered from the fact that Wycliffe more than a century later could write: "Friars now say that bishops can fight best of all men, and that it falleth most properly to them, since they are lords of all this world. They say, Christ bade his disciples sell their coats, and buy them swords; but whereto, if not to fight? Thus friars make a great array, and stir up men to fight. But Christ taught not his apostles to fight with the

¹ Pope Nicholas V. modified this rule into the much less stringent regulation that they might not bear arms in offensive warfare.

Voices in the Wilderness

sword of iron, but with the sword of God's word, which standeth in meekness of heart and in the prudence of man's tongue. . . . If manslaying in others be odious to God, much more in priests who should be vicars of Christ."¹

From this extract from Wycliffe's writings we may gather two facts of importance to our investigation:—

(i) That in the Middle Ages clergymen actually themselves took part in warfare. This, startling though it is to us, is an undoubted fact. We hear of bishops who, like secular princes, led their retainers to battle in person, and even boasted of the numbers they had slain with their own hands. That they were not wholly without the sense of the incompatibility of such conduct with their profession is seen by the fact that their weapon was generally a mace or club, with which they could kill an adversary *without shedding his blood*.

(ii) Secondly, it is clear from the way in which Wycliffe here speaks of war that he believed it to be unlawful for a Christian.

In this he was followed by some of the Lollards, whose teaching was very definite:² "Men of warre are not allowed by the Gospel, the Gospel knoweth peace and not warre."³

The writings of Wycliffe influenced thought not only in England but also in Bohemia. There they came into the hands of a certain Peter of Chelcic, who, stirred up by them and the writings of Hus, began to study the Bible and the Church Fathers.

¹ Vaughan's "Life of Wycliffe," Vol. II., p. 212.

² There seem to have been differences of opinion amongst the Lollards on this question, as there were at a later date amongst the Anabaptists and Baptists.

³ "The Sum of Scriptures," quoted in R. M. Jones's "Studies in Mystical Religion," p. 265.

Christ and War

He saw the abuses in the Church of his own day, and he saw the ideal of Jesus Christ. He felt himself called to preach and to write, and in course of time he gained a wide influence over the common people in Bohemia. The protest against war was very prominent in his teaching, as the following incident shows.

In the year 1419 Ziska, the Husite leader, was urging the followers of Hus to take up arms for their defence, when Peter opposed him contending that war is a crime.

"What is war?" he asked; "It is a breach of the laws of God! All soldiers are violent men, murderers, a godless mob!"

In one of his pamphlets he asked, "When has God recalled His commands, 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'thou shalt not steal,' 'thou shalt not take thy neighbour's goods'?" If God has not repealed these commands they ought still to be obeyed to-day in Prague and Tabor. I have learned from Christ and by Christ I stand; and if the Apostle Peter himself were to come down from heaven and say that it was right to take up arms to defend the truth I should not believe him."¹

The strength of Peter of Chelcic's protest against war will be appreciated when we realise that the Husites, with whom he at any rate in part agreed, were the persecuted party, and it was them that he urged not to defend themselves.

From the labours of Peter of Chelcic sprang the movement which later developed into the Moravian Church, a Church which, like the Society of Friends, has all through its existence maintained a protest against all war. In the most desperate straits the early Moravian brethren never defended themselves. "No weapon did they use except the pen. They never retaliated, never rebelled, never took up arms

¹ Hutton, "History of the Moravian Church," pp. 35, 36.

Voices in the Wilderness

in their own defence, never even appealed to the arm of justice. When smitten on one cheek, they turned the other." ¹

II. The mention of the Moravian Church brings us to the very threshold of the Reformation.

At that great epoch, when men's minds were intent on restoring the purity of the Church of Christ, the question of war came very prominently to the front. Luther himself in the earlier part of his career was so opposed to war that Sir Thomas More could charge him with carrying the doctrines of peace to the extreme limits of non-resistance. Unfortunately he in later life countenanced the bloody suppression of the Peasants' Revolt, so that he cannot be quoted as a consistent opponent of all war.

Erasmus also wrote very strongly on the subject : " If there be anything in the affairs of mortals, which it is in the interests of men not only to attack, but which ought by every possible means to be avoided, condemned, and abolished, it is of all things war, than which nothing is more impious, more calamitous, more widely pernicious, more inveterate, more base, or in sum more unworthy of a man, not to say of a Christian."

It is evident that amongst the Reformers there was no thought of quiet acquiescence in war as natural, inevitable, and right. Many of them endeavoured to answer the question " Under what circumstances, if at all, is war permitted to the Christian ? "

Thus Calvin ² maintains that circumstances may arise in which a Christian magistrate is justified in ordering his people to bear arms against a foe, and quotes several Old Testament instances in support of

¹ Hutton, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

² " Institutes," IV. 20, 12.

Christ and War

his opinion. (It is noticeable that he only cites one passage from the New Testament, Luke iii. 14.)¹

But it is not possible to consider Calvin an advocate of war, for he contemplates a Christian State waging war only in self-defence, and even then reluctantly. He says: "But all magistrates must here be particularly cautious (*i.e.*, if about to go to war) not to give way in the slightest degree to their passions . . . or if they have to take up arms against an enemy, *that is an armed robber, they must not readily catch at the opportunity, nay, they must not take it when offered unless compelled by the strongest necessity.*" Would not the carrying out of this teaching, which comes short of what we have seen to be implied in the New Testament, have prevented many wars of the last three hundred years? But even this very modified approval of war does not represent his original opinion on the question. The position of the Reformed Churches, threatened on every side by the armed hosts of Catholicism, appeared to make self-defence necessary for their continued existence, so Calvin entered on the path of compromise, justifying his action from the Old Testament; yet his earlier writings show that at one time he had maintained that "Trust in the power of man is to be unconditionally renounced; if there is need God will work a miracle to save His Church."²

Hugo Grotius, the great jurist, had a considerable influence on the decision which the Protestant Churches came to on this question. In his great work, "*De Jure Belli et Pacis*"³ (published 1627),

¹ This passage is one of those we discussed in Chapter I, p. 20.

² Troeltsch, "*Die Soziallehre der Christlichen Kirchen*," p. 725, note.

³ An account of his views is given in "*International Tribunals*," pp. 122—129.

Voices in the Wilderness

he justifies war, yet, like Calvin, with great reservations. He condemns wars for the balance of power, and wars of religion. He does not think it right that a Christian should be forced to fight in a war which he believes to be unjust, or in any case against his conscience. And he suggests three ways of avoiding war—(1) Negotiation, (2) Arbitration, (3) Casting lots. In discussing arbitration he suggests congresses of Christian powers, thus early foreshadowing the Hague Conferences. The immediate effect of the work of Grotius was to confirm the prevalent opinion that war was not forbidden by Christ. But it also had a more lasting influence on the thought and action of Christendom by implanting in men's minds the ideas of international law and arbitration which may yet bear fruit.

While the more influential leaders of Protestantism allowed themselves to be persuaded of the lawfulness of war, there arose in many parts of Europe sects who were determined in a more radical manner to revert to apostolic Christianity. They have come down to us in history with the ill name of fanatics, and undoubtedly they often showed a deplorable lack both of prudence and moderation. They were frequently exclusive, intolerant and extreme. Yet their very intolerance was a proof of deep earnestness and singleness of purpose which could bear no compromise with wrong. And we have in judging of them to remember that our knowledge of them comes mainly from their opponents in the established Churches, and is therefore not untinged with prejudice, and that intolerance was by no means peculiar to them, but was to be found in almost every sincerely religious man at that time, and not least in those who condemned them.

In view of the fact that such prominent reformers as Luther and Calvin appear to have come very near

Christ and War

to condemning all war, it is not surprising that some of these sects whose desire was to revive primitive Christianity should have emphatically condemned it. Two of the sects which arose early in the sixteenth century on the Continent were the Anabaptists and the Family of Love; unlike in many of their beliefs and practices, they had, in their early development at least, this in common, that many of the leaders in both movements strongly maintained that all participation in war is forbidden to the Christian.

It is true that some of the later Anabaptists on the Continent attempted to bring about the Kingdom of God by force of arms, and fell into Antinomianism and dissoluteness of life in the infamous kingdom of Münster. Their excesses brought discredit on the name Anabaptist, but the following quotation shows both how far they had departed from the spirit of the early apostles of the movement and how strongly the latter thought on the question.

Conrad Grebel, of Zurich, one of the earliest Anabaptists, wrote in 1524: "The Gospel and its followers shall not be guarded by the sword. Truly believing Christians are sheep in the midst of wolves, sheep ready for the slaughter; they must be baptised in fear and in need, in tribulation and death, that they may be tried to the last, and enter the fatherland of eternal peace, not with carnal, but with spiritual weapons. *They use neither the sword of the world nor of war, for to kill is forbidden.*"¹

Menno Simons, the founder of the Dutch Anabaptists (Mennonites), also opposed all war and every form of capital punishment. Nor did the protest against war cease among the Anabaptists with the early years of the movement; nearly a century later John Smyth, a leader of the English

¹ R. M. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

Voices in the Wilderness

Anabaptists, in his short confession repeats it in the following words :—

“ They that are redeemed of the Lord do change their fleshly weapons, namely, their swords into shares, and their spears into scythes, do lift up no sword, neither have nor consent to battle. Yea rather they are called of Him (whom they are commanded to obey by a voice heard from heaven) to the following of His unarmed, unweaponed life and His cross bearing footsteps.”¹

Many Anabaptists demonstrated the reality of their testimony against war by refusing to take up arms in self-defence, and by cheerfully bearing persecution even to death.

The Family of Love was a deeply mystical sect of which a very interesting account is given in R. M. Jones’s “ Studies in Mystical Religion.” It is enough to say here that they took their rise in Holland about 1530, that their founder’s name was Henry Nicholas. Like the Quakers, the Family of Love rejected judicial oaths, and condemned war and capital punishment. Henry Nicholas wrote: “ In the House of Love men do not curse or swear ; they do not destroy nor kill any. They use no outward swords or spears. They seek to destroy no flesh of men ; but it is a fight of the cross and patience to the subduing of sin.”²

“ Brawling and discord do I not hold for any Christian fight, seeing men do thereby forsake love.”³

III. In the cases so far discussed a literal understanding of the teaching of Jesus seems to have led to the condemnation of all war. The opponents of war generally quoted the command, “ Thou shalt not

¹ R. M. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 411.

² *Ibid.*, 437.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 432, note.

Christ and War

kill," and the extension of that command in the Sermon on the Mount. Its defenders pointed out that in the Old Testament the Israelites were ordered to make war, and twisted a few New Testament passages of doubtful interpretation to support their contention that such commands were still valid for Christians. Probably the mystical sects were themselves influenced by the thought that the high worth and destiny of man made human life too sacred a thing to be taken even under the greatest provocation. And the general effect of the teaching of the New Testament confirmed such a conclusion. Yet even they generally defended their position by proof-texts.

With the early Quakers the case was different; they were not unwilling to use proof-texts, yet they made it quite clear that it was not such proof-texts which brought them to their view in the matter. The influence of the spirit of Christ within them was such that they were unable to take part in wars. "It had taken away the occasion of all wars."¹

"The seed [that is, the spiritual life of a Christian] was redeemed out of all earthly things, and [out of] that nature whence wars arise."²

Many similar quotations could be given showing how their protest against all war arose from a new spiritual life within them which "brought them into the covenant of peace which was before wars and strifes were."

There are two facts which are of great interest in connection with the peace testimony of the early Friends.

(i) It was first put forward at a time when war

¹ Fox, "Journal," Vol. I., p. 68.

² Pearson, quoted by W. C. Braithwaite, "Beginnings of Quakerism," p. 161.

Voices in the Wilderness

was being waged and when it was difficult to avoid taking part in it.

(ii) It was not at first recognised by all Quakers that war was incompatible with their profession, but within the first generation it became a standard testimony with them—a testimony which has been consistently maintained to the present day.

As these two facts have a definite bearing on practical action we may enlarge upon them with advantage.

(i) The classical protest of George Fox against war was made about the year 1650, when the Civil War was still dragging on. The occasion was this: Fox had been for some time in prison at Derby, and his sentence was nearly expired. At that time the authorities were endeavouring to gather troops for the Commonwealth, and, realising that Fox was a powerful character who had a great influence over those with whom he had to do, they endeavoured to induce him to be captain of a company. Fox tells us "The soldiers said they would have none but me." This was a chance that most men would have eagerly accepted—immediate escape from prison and a responsible and honourable position. He refused it. His words are worth quoting again, for they go to the heart of the matter: "I told them I knew from whence all wars arose, even from the lust, according to James's doctrine; and that I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars. . . . I told them I was come into the covenant of peace, which was before wars and strifes were."¹ He knew full well that his refusal meant a recommitment to prison, as proved to be the case. The people, he tells us, thought he would never come out of the dungeon alive, but he had faith in God that there was a work for him to do there.

¹ "Journal," Bicentenary ed., Vol. I., pp. 68, 69.

Christ and War

It is clear from this incident that, far from the Quaker testimony against war being a protest of comfortable people against something disturbing to their rest and quiet, as it is sometimes represented, it was in its first rise a stern and hard choice, motivated only by a strong sense of duty and the belief in Divine leading. And both in the early days of Quakerism and throughout its history there have never been wanting men who were ready to face the consequences of refusing to fight. In some cases men who were already in the fighting profession, either on land or sea, became convinced that warfare was contrary to the spirit of Christ, and at once obeyed the Divine guidance by refusing to fight. Thus in 1656 the master gunner of the *Mermaid* frigate said no power should command him to fire a gun whereby blood might be spilt.¹

But more frequent were the cases where men were pressed into the services. In the time of the Commonwealth and Restoration not a few Quakers were impressed for the navy. They bore their testimony against war unflinchingly, suffering in many cases severely for it. — One of the most striking examples is that of Richard Sellar, whose own account of his refusal and sufferings is contained in Besse's "Sufferings of the People called Quakers."²

Sellar, a Scarborough fisherman, was pressed to serve in the navy in the war that was then in progress between England and Holland (1665). He refused to go on board the vessel, so was hoisted on board and kicked about until very much bruised. Not only did he refuse to fight, but also to eat, for, as he quaintly put it, "*As I was not free to do the King's work, I would not live at his charge for victuals.*"

¹ W. C. Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, p. 520.

² Besse, Vol. II., p. 112.

Voices in the Wilderness

When the ship touched at Bridlington some fellow-Quakers provided him with food, so that he did not entirely starve. For some time he lay heavily loaded with irons, kicked and beaten by all who came near him. At last he was brought before a court-martial and condemned to be rolled to death in a cask driven full of nails with the points inward. Some of the officers interceded for him ; and the sentence was commuted to hanging. Next day, when he was led out to be executed, several of his fellow-sailors besought that his life might be spared (for his truly Christian character and patient bearing of suffering had touched many hearts). The commander, Sir Edward Spragg, finally released him. Before Sellar was landed the ship took part in an engagement, and he gained the regard of the whole ship's company by fearlessly attending to the wounded and carrying them down below under a constant fire from the enemy. He was also instrumental in saving the ship from going aground. When he was discharged at the port of London the commander gave him a certificate which would prevent him being pressed again.

The refusal to serve in the army in several continental countries has entailed long and severe imprisonments and much ill-treatment to many Quakers. The great rigour of the German military system has driven away group after group of Friends, who have sought refuge in the United States or in England. Numbers have had to leave Norway and Denmark for the same reason, though in the latter countries it is possible in some cases to evade military service.

Some of the most striking examples of refusal to join the army come from the Southern side in the American Civil War. When the army had difficulty in obtaining volunteers the ranks were

Christ and War

filled up by ballot. If a man desired to escape service he was allowed to do so by providing a substitute. This the Friends declined to do, and in consequence laid themselves open to the punishment of those who refused to fight—which was death. Officers naturally preferred to induce the Quakers to serve rather than have them shot. And in consequence many underwent severe sufferings. The endeavour was made to starve some into submission ; others were tortured by being hung up by their thumbs or prodded with the bayonet. But they held to their convictions, and though in several cases *they were ordered to be shot, and the firing party was actually drawn up before them, not one of them lost his life.*

In our colonies of Australia and New Zealand at the present time, under the Defence Acts, youths of 14 and upwards are liable for military training. If they object—even if for conscientious reasons—they are imprisoned. At first it was as common felons ; now they are sent to military camps, where, in the words of one of the officers, “ We will make them serve or break their hearts.”¹

From these facts it will be clear that deep and strong conviction has been behind the Quaker's refusal to fight.

(ii) That some of the early Quakers did not at once realise that war was incompatible with their profession is seen from the fact that soldiers who became Quakers did not always leave the army as soon as possible.²

This, however, was only in the very early days of Quakerism. It soon became quite evident to all that any share in making war was impossible to them. In several cases it was in the heat of action

¹ See also Appendix to Chapter VII.

² W. C. Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, pp. 229, 519.

Voices in the Wilderness

itself that the conviction was forced upon the Quaker that war was contrary to the true Light. The case of Thomas Lurting is interesting in this connection. He had served under Blake in 1657, and had risen to be boatswain of a ship of war. A group of Quakers were on board his ship, who had not realised that war was impossible to them. These were persecuted by Lurting. But at last, being impressed by their goodness and care for one another in sickness (for a severe epidemic had attacked the ship), he became favourable to them. Still they had not come to regard war as contrary to Christianity, and on account of their trustworthiness and sterling character were considered the best men on board. As they came into action against a Spanish man-of-war, and Lurting was himself engaged in working a gun, the thought suddenly struck him "What if now thou killest a man?" He put on his clothes again and walked away; naturally he was asked if he was wounded, to which he answered "No, but under some scruple of conscience on account of fighting." From this time forward Lurting and his friends desired to get their discharge, for they could not fight. It was some time, however, before they could do this, and for refusal to fight Lurting narrowly escaped death.¹

The Quaker refusal to take part in war has, as we noticed, been maintained throughout the whole course of their history. On account of this refusal Quakers have had three accusations brought against them:—

- (i) Cowardice, because they would not be soldiers.
- (ii) Acquiescence in evil, because they refused to fight in a just cause.
- (iii) Willingness to let others do the fighting and training for them while they themselves were able

¹ W. C. Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, p. 521.

Christ and War

to get rich in the peaceful security of a well-defended country.

We must inquire whether all or any of those charges can be substantiated. Certainly there are black sheep in every flock, and possibly members of the Society of Friends could have been found at any time in its history against whom one or all of these accusations might have been rightly made. But the question is not, are such charges true of an isolated individual here and there? but, have they been true of Quakers generally?

(i) Cowardice. It is abundantly clear from instances cited above that the refusal to fight in many cases brought much more suffering in its train than would be likely to be the lot of an average soldier. And the boldness of the original Quaker leaders in proclaiming their message and taking the consequences must entirely acquit *them*, at any rate, of lack of courage.

(ii) The reason that Quakers will not go to war to put an end to evil is not because they acquiesce in evil, but because they believe war itself to be an evil, and that evil does not destroy evil, but rather tends to increase it. They are far from acquiescing in evil. Quakers are to be found amongst the leaders in every struggle against moral evil which has taken place in the last one hundred and fifty years in England and America. From the anti-slavery campaign, which Friends began in the United States almost one hundred years before that country was really stirred in the matter, to the anti-opium crusade, which is now apparently drawing to a successful issue, Friends have been hard at work fighting evil.

“Acquiescence in evil when the means were at hand to strike it down morally never was a part of their principles or practice. . . . Quakers were not

Voices in the Wilderness

non-resistants. They resisted most courageously, and at their best most successfully, many forms of political ills. Their resistance only ceased when they were asked to use immoral means." ¹

(iii) The third accusation brought against the Quakers, that they were willing to reap the fruits of peace and security gained for them by others in war, appears to have more truth in it than have the other charges. We must therefore investigate it more closely.

First of all it must be recognised that Quakers, ever since the State ceased to persecute them, have enjoyed its protection. The protection of the army and navy extends to all who are within the State, whether they desire to be so protected or no. But the contention of those who consistently hold Quaker principles towards this armed defence is that it is unnecessary, or at least would be unnecessary, if all the people in the country were to hold their views. And not only so, but that, far from being a protection and preventive of war, armaments are at the present time the chief cause of the fear of war, and have in times past caused more wars than they have prevented.² Such reasoning, it is said, is *a priori* and contrary to experience. It is *a priori*, but it cannot be said to be contrary to experience until an attempt has been made to bring it to the practical test of experience. At the time when the Quakers arose no such attempt had been made. A Quaker, William Penn, made the experiment. He and his companions founded, and their successors maintained, a large province in America—Pennsylvania—for seventy years without any means of defence. They deliberately desired

¹ Sharpless, "Quakerism in the American Colonies," p. 463.

² See Chapters VII. and VIII.

Christ and War

not to defend themselves. The Indians in North America were at the same time frequently at war with other English Colonists, but never with the Quakers of Pennsylvania, because they knew that the Quakers would do them no harm, and would treat them justly. The end of this state of affairs came when the English Government forced the Pennsylvanians to provide soldiers to help in a war which they had no part in beginning. Then the Quakers, who by this time were not a majority of the colonists, gave up all share in the government. So far as I know this is the only instance in history of a State deliberately refusing to take measures for its defence, and it was perfectly successful. It is therefore untrue to say that the views of Friends in this matter are contrary to experience, for in the only case in which they have ever been tried they proved a success.¹

But while Pennsylvania is the only State whose government has been successfully carried on for a number of years without defence of armaments,

¹ It is sometimes suggested that this experiment failed because it continued only about seventy years. But in what sense is it true to say it failed? Pennsylvania was not attacked by armed force and compelled to take up arms. What happened was this: after seventy years of success the experiment was given up. There were two reasons for this: (a) pressure from the English Government, which in itself might not have been enough to persuade the Quakers to give up the experiment; coupled with (b) pressure from within. Many colonists in Pennsylvania had no sympathy with the Quaker objection to fighting, and as the Quakers were no longer a majority in the colony they could not continue acting against the wishes of the majority; for Quakers do not believe in compelling men to do right. They then took the only course which seemed open to them: they allowed the non-Quaker majority to rule the colony.

The experiment, then, was a failure only in so far as people did not believe in it sufficiently to continue it. As long as it was tried it was successful.

Voices in the Wilderness

the refusal of individuals to defend themselves even in times of great danger of armed attack have been frequent, and their success has been astonishing.

In the early days of the American colonies over a long period of time wars with the Indians were the rule rather than the exception. The colonists generally went about armed, and, in the districts at a distance from the English settlements, seldom dared to go except in company. Lonely farmhouses were built so that they could be defended, and were strongly barred. The Quakers, on the other hand, never carried arms; and made it their practice generally not even to bar and bolt their doors, so that they were perfectly defenceless and could have been slain at any time. In New England in 1704, at a time of constant terror from the Indians, when killings and scalpings were of daily occurrence all around them, the Quakers were unmolested.

A Friend, Thomas Chalkley, who was travelling in New England at this time writes as follows: "About this time the Indians were very barbarous in the destruction of the English inhabitants, scalping some and knocking out the brains of others, men, women and children, by which the country was greatly alarmed both by night and day; but the great Lord of all was pleased wonderfully to preserve our Friends, especially those who kept faithful to their peaceable principles according to the doctrine of Christ in the Holy Scriptures as recorded in His excellent sermon which He preached on the mount."

He mentions that amongst the many hundred of settlers who were slain he could only hear of three Friends, and they in *a spirit of distrust* had taken weapons to defend themselves. The Indians said "they had no quarrel with the Quakers, for they

Christ and War

were a quiet, peaceable people, and hurt nobody, and that therefore none would hurt them."¹

Even more striking is the experience of Irish Friends at the time of the great Irish Rebellion of 1798. At that time of terror and massacre, when many hundreds of Protestants were killed by the rebels, only one² Quaker lost his life. A brief account of the action of Friends before and during this terrible time will here be useful.

In the time of unrest preceding the Irish Rebellion of 1798 the quarterly meetings of Friends in Ireland suggested through the monthly meetings that all Friends should destroy any guns or other warlike weapons which they might have, "*to prevent them being made use of to the destruction of our fellow-creatures, and more fully and clearly to support our peaceable and Christian testimony in these perilous times.*" This suggestion was made in 1796, two years before the rising took place, and was carried out by almost all Friends. Thus the Quakers gave up all means of self-defence at a time when most people would have rather laid in a stock of weapons, and did this in order *that there might be no chance of any of them defending themselves.* During the whole time of the Rebellion Friends refused to side with either party, thus incurring suspicion from both sides; nor would they defend their own lives or property. They sheltered the refugees of both sides, providing food for the hungry without thought of their opinions. In face of much calumny and false accusation they maintained fair dealing both with rebels and soldiers. Many Friends attended their meetings as at ordinary times, often walking miles

¹ Journal of Thomas Chalkley, Chap. ii., quoted by Thomas Hancock in "The Principles of Peace Exemplified," tract No. ix., Peace Society.

² See below, p. 97.

Voices in the Wilderness

through districts infested by rebels, threatened constantly and taken prisoner often, but as often released. During the Rebellion, while the other Protestants killed by the rebels were to be counted by *hundreds*, only one Friend lost his life, and he had forsaken his peace principles, donned a military uniform, and actually attempted to shoot certain of the rebels. His case, therefore, is not really an exception to the rule that no Friends were killed. Nor is this all. By their steadfast truthfulness and unswerving loyalty to principle several Friends were able materially to assist in bringing about peace. Abraham Shackleton and others were able to obtain lenient terms for the rebels in Ballitore by interceding on their behalf with Colonel Colin Campbell, who commanded in Athy. In another case a letter from a Quaker obtained the release of a prisoner who had been mistakenly taken as a rebel and would otherwise certainly have been shot. Their houses also became havens of refuge for those in terror for their lives: *So that sometimes at the same time both loyalists and rebels were enjoying the protection of the defenceless Quaker.*

The Friends looked upon their marvellous preservation in this time of terror as a signal instance of the Divine protection extended to those who endeavoured in everything to obey the law of God. And when we remember that the Catholic Irish rebels regarded them as not less Protestants and heretics than Presbyterians and others, and that the soldiers were at first very suspicious of their refusal to aid them in pursuit of rebels, we are forced to conclude that their preservation was not due to their particularly favourable circumstances, but to the cause to which they ascribed it. Is it not natural that in God's world those who obey God's laws should be preserved?

Christ and War

A Moravian settlement near Derry, whose members also held a testimony against all war, had a similar experience of preservation.¹

From these instances it is seen not only that the Quakers were preserved in spite of their refusal to defend themselves—a sufficiently striking fact, when it is remembered that in precisely similar circumstances great numbers of those who endeavoured to defend themselves lost their lives—but that in many cases their fearless spirit, combined with justice and benevolence to all, so impressed their enemies that many of the latter became their staunch friends. They thus demonstrated by their lives that the method of action which our Lord suggested in the words “Resist not evil” (see Chapter I., p. 24) is not only morally on the highest plane, but when carried out in the true spirit of love is likely to be abundantly successful. Nor is this unnatural. It is not easy to quarrel with one who refuses to quarrel, and to do harm to a manifestly unoffending person who exhibits no fear requires either great determination or an exceptionally evil disposition.

We can, then, see psychologically how a man without outward defence may by his honesty and fearlessness turn his enemies into friends. But we shall not be wrong in ascribing the success of his action to the Divine protection, for it is by the love of God within him, casting out fear, that he is defended. The peace of God, which can only come from trust and obedience, is his defence. And it is a more sure defence than anything outward. Two instances from the modern mission field show how this inward defence may guard a man through a hard fight and finally make him conqueror.

¹ For an extended account of the experiences of Friends at this time, see Thomas Hancock, *op. cit.*, and “Six Generations of Friends in Ireland.”

Voices in the Wilderness

About fifteen years ago a Korean named Han, a colporteur of the British and Foreign Bible Society, was working in Po-san, where in those days there were no Christians. He sang a hymn to collect a crowd and spread his books for sale. A gigantic bully on the edge of the crowd elbowed his way through and gave Mr. Han a terrible beating. The latter offered no resistance, but prayed for his enemy. At last the bully let him go. He was badly bruised and kept his bed for ten days. Nevertheless, when well enough he returned to his former place, again laid out his Bibles, and again sang his hymn. Again the bully came and beat him, this time with a club. Mr. Han was unable to walk home, and was laid up for nearly a month. A local magistrate heard of the incident and suggested that he should have the bully arrested and punished. Mr. Han said, "No, please don't do that; I am praying for him that God will touch his heart and make him a workman for the Kingdom." When well again Mr. Han went to his usual corner in great fear, for the local fame of the bully was that he was a "devil" who terrorised the whole neighbourhood. This time, however, he stood on the outside of the crowd listening to Mr. Han's hymn and preaching. Then he beckoned him into a house and asked forgiveness for his former cruelty. He became a changed man.¹

A similar story comes from Egypt. A colporteur offered his books to a company of Moslems, "Know ye not that we are Muslimeen?" one asked; another took a book, looked at it, and threw it down, then struck the colporteur and said, "Go you Kafir" (infidel). A few days later the same colporteur was again selling his books when the Egyptian who had struck him came to him and said, "I am sorry that

¹ See B. F. B. S. Report, 1910—11, "A Fountain Unsealed," p. 62.

Christ and War

I struck and insulted you. I did it because I had heard that your book taught that if you were struck on one cheek, you were to turn the other also, and I wanted to see if you would act according to its teaching. I now want the book in which such teaching is given.”¹

IV. It appears, then, that the peaceful principles of Jesus Christ do work successfully when really put into practice, whether by individuals or by states. It is not from enemies, rebels, or heathen savages that those who attempt to practise true Christian forgiveness and love need expect harm, it is from the so-called Christian Governments of the civilised world, as we saw in instances already given.

But the sufferings of the early Friends for refusing to fight, or of those of later times for refusing to serve in conscript armies, have been but slight as compared with those of simple peasants in Russia, Hungary, and elsewhere.

Two sects of modern times, the Doukhobors in Russia and the Nazarenes in Hungary and Servia, have maintained a consistent testimony against all participation in war, often with the most terrible consequences.

The Nazarenes are a little known sect who sprang up about the middle of the nineteenth century in Hungary, and some of whom settled in Servia. It appears that they, like the Waldenses of earlier times, aimed at a revival of primitive Christianity. They are heretics in nothing except in not uniting with the Roman or Greek Churches and in their protest against war. It is their refusal to fight or swear—a refusal founded, of course, on the Sermon on the Mount—which has brought down persecu-

¹ B. F. B. S. Report, 1911—12, “More Golden than Gold,” p. 70.

Voices in the Wilderness

tion upon them. Their young men have suffered the most terrible tortures rather than join the army, and in Servia especially their persecution has been very severe.

Much more widely known are the Doukhobors of Southern Russia. They came into prominence about the end of the eighteenth century. Until about 1879 they were persecuted merely as dissenters from the Russian Church. They were deported from their home in the fruitful lands of Southern Russia into the cold mountains of the Caucasus and harassed in many ways. Then there was a period of comparative ease. But in 1887, when conscription was introduced, their troubles became worse than ever, for they refused to fight or bear arms. Some were consigned to the disciplinary battalion, where by torture the attempt was made to induce them to serve as soldiers; some were sent to Siberia. In other cases soldiers were quartered in their villages and given almost unlimited licence.

This persecution continued with more or less violence for ten years, when the majority of the Doukhobors emigrated to Canada, largely through the instrumentality of English and American Friends, who have since helped them as they were able in the land of their adoption. The Doukhobors, like Tolstoy, carry the principle of non-resistance to extremes in a way which Quakers have not done. Supposing that all law and civil order depend on force, and holding that all use of force is contrary to the teaching of Jesus, they reject all human governments, and have refused in some cases to obey the useful and benevolent regulations of the Canadian Government. Such views are not surprising when we consider that to them government and tyranny are indistinguishable. Living under a free and democratic Government in Canada, we may expect

Christ and War

that their views on the matter will in course of time be modified.

In our early chapters we saw that there is ample foundation in the teaching of Jesus Christ and His apostles for the refusal to take any part in war.

We have seen how the primitive Church would have nothing to do with war, and how, when in later times true-hearted and simple-minded men endeavoured to restore primitive Christianity, they found that the disapproval of all war was involved in it.

We have seen also that many of those who consistently carried out this principle were wonderfully preserved from fierce and savage enemies, but that under "Christian" Governments they have had to suffer terribly for their refusal to fight. For it is only under "Christian" military conditions that the attempt is made to force men to disobey the teaching of Jesus Christ in this matter.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

"Christian Non-Resistance," by Adin Ballou.
And pamphlets—

"Pennsylvania: a Study in Empire Building," by Howard Hodgkin, issued by M. L. Cooke, 90, St. Anne's Hill, Wandsworth.

"The Principles of Peace exemplified in the conduct of the Society of Friends in Ireland," by Thomas Hancock, Peace Society.

CHAPTER V

THE DAWN OF HOPE

WE have already seen that the teaching of Jesus Christ cuts at the root of war by forbidding the passions from which it springs. Thus not only, if carried into practice, would it put an end to war, but to all other evils which come from selfishness and lack of love. The duty of Christian people is, then, to put the teaching of Jesus Christ into practice. And this must be done in two ways :—

(i) Christ's spirit of love and self-sacrifice must be the controlling influence in their own lives, expressing itself in Christ-like conduct.

(ii) They must actively work for the removal of all that stands in the way of the extension of the Kingdom of God in the world.

One great obstacle to the advance of the Kingdom of God is the prevalence of war and war preparation. Its effects are seen in several ways.

(i) War and war preparation tend to separate nation from nation. Their real identity of interest is overlooked and a largely fictitious antagonism substituted. For instance, England and Germany have in reality more in common than any other two European nations, and are able to help one another in nearly every department of life. Yet the constant increase in war preparation of both countries has brought about a state of strain which several times in the last few years has led us to the brink of war.

Christ and War

(ii) The constant thought of war or preparation for war tends to emphasise the competitive as opposed to the co-operative view of life. So that large numbers of people really believe that what is to the advantage of one nation or individual must of necessity be to the disadvantage of another ; that the more there is of yours the less there is of mine ; that the battle of life is essentially a battle against one another. Men's minds are so obsessed with this idea that they fail to see what both reason and experience teach us, that no great work is possible without co-operation ; that unrestrained competition is wasteful, and that war is destructive both of men and of material things.

(iii) Both the thoughts and the material resources of Western nations are so largely taken up with war preparation that they have neither time nor money adequately to deal with the vast social questions that cry out for attention. Thus the very life of Europe is endangered by excess of preparations to defend it.

(iv) It is the Christian nations of the world that are most strongly armed. And this leads the nations of the East to suppose that Christianity countenances war. To some this is a great barrier to receiving the Gospel. The Hindu or Buddhist, for example, would say, " My religion must be better than Christianity, for it condemns war, while Christianity encourages it." Were, then, the Western nations to disarm, co-operation and mutual helpfulness between the nations could increase, attention and money would be liberated for social reform, greater success would follow Missionary work, and a saner and truer standard of life would be set for the masses of men.

Is it possible to remove from the way of advance of the Kingdom of God the obstacle of war ?

The Dawn of Hope

Three facts give us great cause for hope that it is possible :—

I. War is increasingly recognised as a barbarous method of settling disputes.

II. The common-sense of mankind is beginning to recognise that war is irrational.

III. It is already a widely-accepted fact that war is economically unprofitable.

Let us examine these in turn.

I. WAR IS BARBAROUS.

It is in essence cruel. Even if its cause be just and good, it of necessity inflicts so much suffering, much of it on defenceless people, most of it on innocent people, that a humane person would hesitate to wage it.

Professor Lecky says of war as follows :—“ War is not and never can be a mere passionless discharge of a painful duty. It is in its essence and as a main condition of its success to kindle into fierce exercise amongst great masses of men the destructive and combative passions—passions as fierce and malevolent as that with which the hound hunts the fox to its death or the tiger springs upon its prey. Destruction is one of its chief ends. Deception is one of its chief means, and one of the great arts of successful generalship is to deceive in order to destroy. Whatever other elements may mingle with and dignify war, this at least is never absent, and however reluctantly men may enter into war, however conscientiously they may endeavour to avoid it, they must know that when the scene of carnage has once opened, these things must be not only accepted and condoned, but stimulated, encouraged and applauded. It would be difficult to conceive a disposition more remote from the

Christ and War

morals of ordinary life, not to speak of the Christian ideals, than that with which soldiers, most animated with the fire and passions that lead to victory, rush forward to bayonet the foe."

Lecky is right; not only are the terrible sufferings of the battlefield and campaign¹ a strong ground of opposition to war, but the state of mind, the devilish passions of the combatants, are a much weightier reason against it. No wonder that a general well accustomed to war and successful in it said, "War is hell."²

All this applied just as much to war many centuries ago as it applies to war to-day. War always has entailed terrible cruelty. But while men generally were still barbarous, while suffering in others awakened sometimes amusement, sometimes loathing and disgust, but seldom pity, while successful deception and fraud were admired and truth and honesty despised, there could be no general disapproval of war. In those days men who made war did not talk of war as a stern necessity; they enjoyed it.³ But times have changed. There is

¹ Those who have seen war assure us that these sufferings are infinitely more terrible than we who only read newspaper reports can have any conception of.

² General Sherman, American Civil War.

³ In an interesting article on "War and Poetry" which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1902, the writer pointed out a great change in the attitude towards war of modern poets, and indeed of modern men generally, from that prevalent in ancient times. He says:—"They (*i.e.* the moderns) seek a deeper justification (than simply love of country) of actions in themselves contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Christian religion, and to the better and higher instincts of human nature. . . . The deliberate glorification of war by some poets, the subtle justification of it by others, are signs of this movement of feeling. Our ancestors felt no need either to glorify or to justify war. They took it as a normal incident in life, and described its beauties with zest."

The Dawn of Hope

still cruelty in the world, but it is seldom conscious and deliberate.¹

Modern men do not delight in cruelty, they sympathise with suffering and try to relieve it. War is now only tolerated because it is believed to be necessary.

But actions of men that are necessary must be in some form or other rationally justifiable. Can war be justified by sound reasoning? This brings us to our second section.

II. WAR IS IRRATIONAL.

War at the present time is never made avowedly to satisfy cruel and rapacious desires. These may form part of the motive, but no nation dare confess that such desires move it. It is waged to right a wrong, to do justice, or as the last means of settling a dispute which cannot be otherwise settled.

When we went to war in South Africa it was specifically stated that we sought neither gold-fields nor territory; the ostensible reason given was that the dispute could not otherwise be settled, and many English people believed that their fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal were being unjustly and tyrannically treated. Unless they could have been persuaded that we went to war in a just cause they would never have supported the Government in its action. And it may be recognised as generally true that no modern nation will be united in a war policy unless it can be persuaded that the war is made in a just cause. It may allow itself to be

¹ The cruelty of the modern competitive industrial system (or lack of system) is not the intentional cruelty of individual to individual, but rather the unconscious cruelty of the machine in which both masters and men are almost inextricably involved.

Christ and War

persuaded too easily ; but it will not deliberately profess lower motives. It is well, therefore, to consider the general question whether war is an effective method of securing justice.

Normally victory in war comes to the nation which has the strongest, best-equipped, and best-managed army and navy—in other words, it depends on the following factors :—

The physique of its manhood.

The number of men whom it can place in the field.

The amount of material resources over which it has control.

The skill and ability of its generals and admirals.

None of these factors has an essential connection with the justice of its cause.¹ Napoleon is reported to have said, “ God is on the side of the big battalions,” implying that strength of arms alone counts in war.

It is sometimes maintained that what is called the wager of battle allows Providence to decide for the right. This method of deciding private quarrels was in vogue amongst the Anglo-Saxons and remained as the duel, in use in England until the early part of the nineteenth century, but had been discredited long before its final abolition. There was probably much more to be said for its use between individuals, where from the nature of the case there must be some approach to equality of chances, than between nations, where the disparity of resources may be enormous. But whatever can be said for it as a method of obtaining justice can be said with more reason for casting lots, for by the latter method

¹ Possibly soldiers would not fight well in what they *believed* to be an unjust cause ; but as war is now seldom waged by any country till its people believe the cause to be just, this consideration may be neglected. It is to be noted that even the Germans believe their cause in the present war to be just (1914).

The Dawn of Hope

nothing is interposed to prevent God deciding for the right (if He does so interfere), while in the wager of battle the dice are generally loaded.

In the evolution of justice within the State three methods have in turn been used to obtain a just decision. Duelling, casting lots, arbitration—generally in the form of a legal trial. The last may not be a perfect system—no human system ever will be—but it is so much more satisfactory than either of the other two that no one ever suggests throwing it aside and adopting either of them again. Of these three duelling is the least rational, that is the least likely to give a just decision, and we have seen that duelling between individuals is more rational than duelling between States, that is, war. To make war as rational as duelling the ministers responsible for the quarrel in each country ought to fight with one another. But as a matter of fact the actual fighters have had nothing to do with the dispute, and frequently know nothing about it. Carlyle has most graphically depicted the irrationality of war in a passage which may well conclude this section :—

“ What, speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net purport and upshot of war?—To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge, usually some five hundred souls. From these, by certain ‘natural enemies’ of the French, there are successively selected, during the French war, say thirty able-bodied men. Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red; and shipped away, at

Christ and War

the public charges, some two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain; and fed there till wanted.

“And now to that same spot in the south of Spain are thirty similar French artizans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxtaposition; and Thirty stands fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand.

“Straightway the word ‘Fire!’ is given, and they blow the souls out of one another, and in place of sixty brisk useful craftsmen the world has sixty dead carcasses, which it must bury and anew shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot.”¹

It must be granted that war is barbarous, irrational, and seldom, and then only by chance, attains the ends of justice, but still it is maintained that by war a nation that conquers gains much. Is this a fact? It has lately been shown to be an illusion.

III. WAR IS UNPROFITABLE.

In the “Great Illusion” Norman Angell has shown that a modern European war would bring no gain to either country involved in it, but great loss to both, and, if the nations involved were commercially of importance, a loss to the whole civilised world. Competent economists agree that his argu-

¹ Carlyle, “Sartor Resartus,” bk. ii. chap. viii.

The Dawn of Hope

ment is sound and his contention true ; and it is a remarkable fact that a great Russian sociologist, Professor Jacques Novikow, was led by a study of history and economics to propound the same view.¹

In the discussion which follows use has been made of both Norman Angell's work and Novikow's, though the form in which the argument is cast is the writer's own.

There was a time when one nation could gain by the conquest of another nation.² The purpose of war in those days was simply plunder.³ There was no attempt to conceal the object. A strong and warlike tribe lived near to a peaceful tribe, who, *because they were not warlike, had had time to devote themselves to the breeding of cattle, agriculture, and the arts, and thus had become rich.* The riches of the peaceful tribe were attractive to the warriors, and the obvious thing in that age was to steal them. This implied destroying those who attempted resistance ; the rest of the men were either slaughtered or, together with the women and children, enslaved. It is well to notice that even in the remote ages of antiquity the result of such a war was of necessity a set back to civilisation. For—

(a) The amount of material goods in the world had been reduced. Houses had been burnt down ; only portable things had gone to enrich the invaders ; and many even of the portable things must have been destroyed in the struggle.

¹ " War and its Alleged Benefits," a book issued in French at about the same time as Norman Angell published the first draft of his well-known book (" Europe's Optical Illusion " was the original title).

² Novikow maintains that such gains have been always illusory (see " War, &c.," chap. v.), though he allows that there *appeared* to be gain in ancient times.

³ Compare German " Krieg " = " war," from " kriegen " = " to get."

Christ and War

(b) Those who now had possession of the material goods did not know their use as did their makers, and in consequence could not get full value out of them.

(c) Those who were competent to make such goods were either dead or slaves, so that the possibility of advance in material arts was greatly reduced.

(d) Perhaps the worst result of all. The success of the raid would encourage the warrior tribe to devote themselves even more to raiding than before ; so that they would neither themselves advance towards a settled life and material prosperity, nor would they let their neighbours advance.

Such wars, even in those remote ages, made the world poorer. But the conquerors gained both booty and slaves, and thus became rich.¹

Two factors combined to make war profitable to the conquerors in ancient times :—

(i) The conquerors carried off the property of the conquered and enslaved many of them.

(ii) The cost of fitting out the expedition was small compared to the value of property gained in a successful foray.

While both these factors remain, war remains profitable ; but if either is modified or disappears the profit will be lessened. If both should completely disappear all profit from war will disappear too. What place have these factors in modern war ?

Let us begin with the cost of war and war preparation.

The cost of making war is enormous—so enormous that it is quite unlikely that any material goods gained by war can compensate for that cost. So at the present day instead of a small expenditure in

¹ It is probable, as Novikow suggests, that their riches were dearly purchased both from an economic and moral point of view.

The Dawn of Hope

war bringing a large return, a very large expenditure brings in a small return or even no return at all.

But what about spoils? With the immense riches of the present day surely the item of booty must be much larger than it used to be in former times? Strange as it may seem, the answer is in the negative. A number of causes conspire to make booty in modern war an almost negligible consideration. Of these there are three of great importance :—

(i) Conquered peoples are not nowadays enslaved by the conqueror.

(ii) Indiscriminate pillage is contrary to international sentiment.

(iii) While the world is undoubtedly much richer now than in earlier times, the riches cannot be carried off in the form of spoil.

Let us look at these a little in detail.

(i) Conquest meant slavery in ancient barbarian warfare, and means slavery still in many parts of Africa and in some other uncivilised places. But the idea of one Western nation conquering another and making the people slaves has only to be mentioned to be rejected as absurd.

(ii) In ancient times, and particularly when barbarian invaders were attacking ancient civilisation, pillage was a great feature of warfare. After conquest came spoil. The soldier hoped as a result of his fighting to gain some of the wealth of the conquered. This held even in the case of comparatively civilised warfare throughout the Middle Ages. Green¹ shows how in Henry V.'s reign the real source of the passion with which the English baronage pressed for war with France was sheer lust for gold. He says: "So intense was the greed of

¹ "Short History of the English People," Popular ed., p. 273.

Christ and War

gain that only a threat of death could keep the fighting men in their ranks, and the results of victory after victory were lost by the anxiety of the conquerors to deposit their plunder and captives at home before reaping the more military fruits of their success." Of no modern war could such words be written, for not only has the growth of humanitarian sentiment produced a general disapproval of pillage after conquest, but the effect of plundering on the troops who take part in it is so destructive of military efficiency, as the above quotation shows, that generals forbid it from motives of self-interest.

An army that plunders is unlikely to be victorious in a campaign, however many separate battles it may win. Hence plundering has almost entirely disappeared from modern war.

(iii) The property of a modern nation cannot to any large extent be carried off as spoil. We only need to think of what modern property consists to realise the truth of this statement. In ancient times when a man had saved much money he kept it in his house and spent it gradually. In modern times a wealthy man seldom spends his capital. He invests it and lives on the interest. The wealth of a country is then no longer mainly in the form of gold.¹

¹ This alteration in the method of disposing of wealth is seen from the following quotation from "The Stock Exchange," by F. W. Hirst:—

"Any person with prudence and self-restraint can in ordinary times and circumstances secure himself against serious capital depreciation, and obtain a steady dividend on the moneys he has been able to put by from time to time. This was not always so. In fact, until the last century property and trade were so insecure, even in the most settled and civilised countries, that a man who had saved money was often at a loss what to do. He might have to choose between spending it and hiding it away.

"A hundred years ago the use of the cheque was hardly

The Dawn of Hope

This is true of privately-owned wealth. But the difference between ancient and modern States in regard to publicly-owned wealth is even more striking. Ancient cities generally had vast stores of gold laid up in the cellars of their temples. This gold technically belonged to the god in whose temple it was deposited, but was really intended for the public use of the State if an emergency should arise. Modern States, far from having such treasure stores, are always deeply in debt—sometimes to their own citizens, sometimes even to foreigners. Their wealth is in the prosperity of their citizens. The national debt of a modern State constitutes such a charge on the wealth of its people that anything which adversely affects their prosperity may seriously endanger the solvency of the State. That is to say, that the modern State has no national wealth as distinguished from the wealth of its people.

A conqueror, then, cannot hope to seize any national treasure in the conquered country, for there is none. His only chance of gaining wealth from the conquered country is to seize the private wealth of its citizens. This might be appropriated by the simple method of robbery or by the legalised method of taxation for tribute or indemnity.

From a State of the ancient world much wealth understood even in London, and an English country gentleman would have had infinitely more trouble in making a small investment than would nowadays a remote Australian squatter, or a wheat-grower in the wildest West of Canada. A letter posted to London from a distant village of Saskatchewan in 1910 would arrive with far more certainty, and perhaps not less speed, than a letter posted in 1810 from a village in Sutherland or Argyllshire. A penny stamp with a cheque enclosed in a brief letter of instructions to the banker, and the thing is done. But the thrifty Scot of 1810 would have had the utmost difficulty, and great expense as well as risk, in converting a similar amount of cash savings into an interest-bearing security."

Christ and War

could be got by the robbery of its citizens. But the invested wealth of the modern capitalist cannot be appropriated so easily. It is invested, which means that it consists of factories, machinery, houses, ships, railways, public buildings, and national and municipal undertakings. The wealth which is invested in these enterprises cannot be realised. It is locked up. Under conditions of peace and prosperity it is of greater value than its equivalent in gold because it pays interest, that is, it is being increased by use. But war would at once turn the profit of many a business into a dead loss, its capital would represent value on paper only, and it could bring no profit to anyone who forcibly forfeited it, until the country was again restored to peace and prosperity. And if the people of the country had been forcibly dispossessed of their property it would be very long before prosperity could be restored. One nation, then, can greatly damage the prosperity of another by making war upon it. It can do greater damage still by conquering it; and by forcibly forfeiting all or a large proportion of its invested wealth it might ruin it and cripple its prosperity for many years. *But it could not by any of these acts make any gain for itself.*

But this is not all. The capital of a rich nation is invested not only within its own borders but more or less throughout the whole world; and its manufactures depend both for their supplies of raw material and for their customers on other nations. Any damage done to the prosperity of one nation is at once felt to a greater or less degree by all the others. A war, therefore, harms not only the nations who are fighting, but all their neighbours. If the nations at war are not very rich or commercially important, the damage done to the world at large through loss of trade and financial difficulties

The Dawn of Hope

may not be very serious. Thus the Balkan War has not stayed the tide of prosperity in Great Britain or America, though its influence has been felt. But if the powers at war were first-class commercial nations, such as Great Britain and Germany, the trade of the whole world would be affected, and every civilised country would be involved in financial difficulties. The enormous sums of money required to carry on the war would be withdrawn from trade in the countries at war, thereby crippling their commerce. The demand for capital would drive up the bank rate so high that all businesses which depended on loans from bankers—and they are many in every country—would be brought into great difficulties, and many would be entirely ruined.¹

In 1911, during the Morocco difficulties, there was, in certain circles in Germany, a strong desire to go to war with France. War was prevented, not because there was in Germany any expectation of failure—military experts were confident of success—nor even because Great Britain might intervene, though that was possible: it was the influence of German financiers and business men that prevented war breaking out. German trade is largely dependent on foreign capital, for with growing population and expanding trade it is not possible to raise the new capital constantly required at home. France and Great Britain are the chief sources from which capital can be borrowed. To make war on either of these powers would be for Germany to court financial ruin. One does not attack one's banker. When German diplomacy took a strong line and it appeared that a war with

¹ The prompt interference of the Government has partly prevented and partly delayed these financial difficulties in Great Britain. But there are bad times ahead. 1914.

Christ and War

France was probable, the bank rate in Berlin went up, and German commercial houses began to fail. Norman Angell says: "I could trace for you, if I had the time, a really humorous chart establishing the direct relationship between the 'vigour' of German foreign policy and the figures of German commercial insolvency."¹ He goes on to quote a comment on the policy of the German Government by the *Berlin Bourse Gazette*: "The policy which the Government has been pursuing since July 1 has inflicted on our commerce and our industry losses almost as great as they would have suffered from an unsuccessful war." It is possible, as he suggests, that this last is a somewhat exaggerated statement, but it cannot be denied that the threatening attitude of the German Government towards France had a disastrous effect on German commerce.

All this resulted from the *mere threat* of war. Had war really begun the financial difficulties of German industry would have been enormously greater, and would have been felt in every part of the civilised world.

Similar results would at the present day follow the threat of war between any two of the great commercial nations. For the commercial world is one. Banking and the credit system unite together every part, so that anything which threatens the security of property in one part of the world endangers the whole.

We have, then, in considering whether a country can gain by conquering another to face the fact that at the outset, before there had been any decisive battle, before war had even been declared, the commerce of the attacking country would suffer great losses. Further, that when war did begin those losses would be increased, and would be

¹ "The Great Illusion," ed. 1913, p. 150.

The Dawn of Hope

augmented by the capital withdrawn from commerce to carry on the war.

And even if one of the warring nations gained decisive victories and conquered the other, it could not gain by forfeiting the property of the conquered nation. But it may be suggested the conqueror could exact an indemnity or impose tribute. An indemnity is a huge sum of money paid over before the army of occupation finally leaves the conquered country. A tribute is a yearly sum, and can only be exacted as long as the victor retains some control of the conquered country. To levy a tribute the conqueror must practically annex the conquered country and hold it with garrisons. This is a matter of such great expense and difficulty that under modern conditions it is not worth doing. Therefore, if a conqueror is to gain by conquest, an indemnity must be exacted.

When Germany conquered France in 1871 an indemnity was levied and paid remarkably quickly. This occurred only forty years ago. Why should not the same course be taken again? ¹ The German requirements in 1871 were met by France because large numbers of French people hoarded up their money. It was not banked or invested, but laid up in secret places. The solid gold was there and could be lent to the Government in its need. At the present day such is no longer the case in any Western nation. With the great increase of the world's commerce, and the increasing number of secure investments, the whole civilised world has taken to investing its savings instead of hoarding. Not only does this fact make it difficult for one nation to obtain an indemnity from another, but the effect of war

¹ Norman Angell considers it certain that Germany gained nothing by the indemnity (see chap. vi. in "The Great Illusion").

Christ and War

would be greatly to depreciate the value of property. Many hitherto prosperous concerns would have failed, and nearly all would be in such financial difficulties, that, until prosperity was restored, even small sums of money could scarcely be raised.

Another factor must not be overlooked. Owing to the interrelation of trade and credit, the conquering country would suffer severely from the trade depression in the conquered, and anything it might do to increase the latter's financial difficulties would certainly also increase its own.

So that we may confidently assert that at the present day, in the event of war between two first class powers—

Either no indemnity would be exacted by the victor, or, if it were, its effects would be so ruinous on the world at large and on the nation exacting it, that it would be wiser not to have required it.

It may still be objected that Germany, for example, could gain by conquering Great Britain, because then she would own our colonies and India and would have all our trade. But even this contention is fallacious. Let us take the three items separately. Germany, it is said, would gain, by conquest of Great Britain—

(a) Her colonies.

(b) India and other possessions.

(c) Her trade.

(a) How would Germany gain our colonies? They would not belong to her in virtue of her (hypothetical) conquest of the Mother Country. They would each need to be separately subdued. And this would be a matter of extreme difficulty, even if physically possible at all. But what would be the use of it if it were done? We make no gain from our colonies that any other European nation cannot share in. Do they provide an outlet for the

The Dawn of Hope

energetic youth of our land? Germans are just as free to make their homes in our colonies and have done so in large numbers. Do they buy our goods? Yes, but they buy German goods as well. The very slight preferential treatment accorded to British-made goods may be annoying to the foreigner, but it is not worth going to war about.

No material gain worth having could come to Germany by conquest of our colonies. The difficulty of such conquest would be immense and its results nearly valueless.

(b) The British Government has difficulties to contend with in ruling India, but a new-comer would be faced with more difficulties. For the British rule is recognised as generally just and efficient, and is old-established, and by the majority of the people is regarded as in the nature of things. A new-comer would first have to gain control, and then have to gain the experience of how to keep the peace between all the various sections of the people.

But supposing Germany had conquered Great Britain, could it or any other power gain control of India? Is it not more likely that, faced with an army of conquest, the Nationalist movement would gain power and the Indian peoples would declare themselves free? Here, again, Great Britain might lose, but could Germany gain?

But the question comes up, what is there to gain? We have a large trade with India certainly, and if Germany could supply the same goods at as low a price she could share it. There is no protective tariff. The fact is that in some branches of trade German merchants already do large business with India. We get no tribute from India, nor from any of our possessions. One only advantage do we get—careers are open in India for our young men as

Christ and War

civil servants and army officers. That advantage, and probably that advantage alone, could Germany appropriate for herself, *if she could conquer India*.

The fact is that we do not "own" our colonies or India as a man may own an estate. The people who live in them own them, and our gain from them consists almost entirely in trade. And this trade is no monopoly, but can be shared by all commercial nations.¹

(c) If Germany conquered Great Britain she could get our trade. How? Can sixty million people do all their own work and also that of forty million more? She can get our trade if she can produce things better and cheaper than we do. In some lines she does this already. That is why we import goods from Germany. In some branches of trade she has not been able successfully to rival us, and conquering us would not give her that ability. Under present-day conditions, then, no civilised nation can gain by the conquest of another civilised nation.

But have not nations in the past gained by conquest? For example, has not Great Britain gained in the past by the conquest of India? This question cannot be answered by a direct Yes or No. In so far as Great Britain, through the East India Company, having conquered many native princes, stole their hoarded gold and jewels, she gained. But such gains are no longer possible. In so far as, having conquered, she introduced law and order and prosperity where anarchy had reigned, she also gained, as did the world at large. But notice the gain did not come simply from conquest; conquest alone never can bring law and order. A tyrannous military *régime*, extracting the last farthing in taxation from a conquered people,

¹ "The Great Illusion," part i., chap. vii

The Dawn of Hope

which is the logical continuation of conquest, does not bring prosperity and cannot. Prosperity followed British conquest, not because conquest produced it, but because the British people are by nature, as Napoleon derisively said, "a nation of shopkeepers." They have a natural aptitude for trading and developing the resources of a country. This cannot be done without peace and some measure of justice. Hence peace and justice have been the foundation of their success in India and elsewhere.

It is not conquest, but peace, justice, and business ability which produced what prosperity there is in India. Critics of our Indian administration have from time to time pointed out that less expenditure on military matters and more on irrigation and agriculture would produce more prosperity and be better for the country generally. But, it is objected, all this law and order would not have come without conquest. It is true that it did come through conquest, but that does not prove that no better way of establishing commercial relations—for that was our purpose in going to India—could have been found. What we are here attempting to answer is not the academic question, Was conquest the only possible way of bringing prosperity in the past? but the practical question, Is conquest likely to bring profit in the future? And we have seen reason to answer this question in the negative.

The economic argument against war may be thus summed up:—

The ordinary talk of the benefits derived from conquest is full of fallacies. War destroys; it cannot produce wealth. Conquest may destroy the wealth of the conquered country, but it cannot transfer it to the conqueror.

A country does not own its own land or its colonies; its citizens own them. If, therefore,

Christ and War

without going to war one civilised State were to annex another, seeing that the people of each State would still own what they owned before, still work as they worked before, and still earn what they earned before, no one would be either richer or poorer by the transaction. But if the annexation were to take place as the result of war, both States would be the poorer for it.

Sometimes the objection is urged against this economic argument against war that it is sordid. It is said, after all there are higher standards than merely financial gain or loss. It is quite true that there are higher standards, and the attempt has been made in these pages to show that war is also condemned by those higher standards of humanity, reason and religion. The economic argument is not here put forward as the one all-sufficient refutation of the advocates of war, but as a strong confirmation of reasoning founded on other data. The opponent of war on Christian or humanitarian grounds bases his arguments not *on utilitarian reasoning, but on faith*. In the fact that now faith is being confirmed by a dispassionate study of solid facts there is strong encouragement for us to believe that an enlightened conscience may often lead us to conclusions which the slow processes of reason will afterwards confirm.

But is the economic argument really sordid? When we speak of financial stringency and businesses failing, it appears as if our thoughts were concentrated on the desire to get rich. But such disasters spell unemployment to vast numbers of working people, and unemployment means starvation and misery; it means that the bodies and minds of the growing children are stunted, so that instead of the rising generation being better and happier than its parents it is likely to be less able to make the best use of life. In times of trade depression, for

The Dawn of Hope

every rich man who loses his wealth scores of working people are reduced to the verge of starvation. In so far as the economic argument looks at the real well-being and happiness of the great mass of the people, it is not sordid at all, but humane and truly Christian.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

"The Great Illusion," part I.

"War and its Alleged Benefits."

And pamphlet—

"How the Nations Help One Another," by M. L. Cooke.

CHAPTER VI

IS IT IMPOSSIBLE ?

IN the last chapter it was shown that humanitarian sentiment, reason, and a true understanding of the conditions of material prosperity reinforce the Christian appeal for the abolition of war. Under these circumstances, is it impossible for the nations of the world to disarm and agree to live together in perpetual peace? Is there any obstacle, beyond men's natural distrust of revolutionary ideas, that can be urged against general disarmament? Will any vital interests of humanity suffer?

The advocates of war regard disarmament as a dangerous idea and one quite incapable of realisation; some of them go so far as to say that it would be disastrous to the world if it could be realised. What they have to say on the subject may be classified under the following eight heads:—

I. War is a selective agency which aids in the evolution of the human species, and prevents over-population.

II. War advances civilisation.

III. War is decreed by natural law.

IV. The moral effect of war is good.

V. Differences arise between nations which can be settled in no other way but by war.

VI. Justice sometimes requires a nation to go to war.

VII. If all the civilised world were to disarm a barbarian invasion would take place.

VIII. War cannot be abolished, because it

Is it Impossible ?

simply springs from human passion, which cannot be controlled by religion, reason, or expediency.

The object of this chapter is to discuss these in turn.

I. " War is a selective agency which aids in the evolution of the human species, and prevents over-population."

It is a fact that war has in the past killed off very large numbers of men. But before this can be regarded as advantageous to the human race, it has to be established that there is any real danger of over-population. Now, while large portions of the world's surface are very scantily populated and not cultivated, as is the case in Australia, Africa and America, not to mention some portions of Asia, the prospect of over-population is somewhat remote. Also it is to be remembered that in certain nations, as, for instance, France, the birth rate is no longer higher than the death rate, and forces seem to be at work amongst civilised peoples generally which prevent a very rapid expansion of the population. There does not, then, seem to be any reason to retain war in order to prevent the world from becoming overcrowded.

But it is said war is a selective agency helping in the evolution of man by elimination of the unfit. Appeal is here made to the great Darwinian law of the Survival of the Fittest. That race of men or nation which conquers others will, it is said, breed the strongest men and will be best fitted to survive, while the weaker races will be extinguished. But survival in war proves nothing about fitness for life generally, for Darwin's law simply says that organisms survive in any environment which become fitted to that environment. If the environment is war, the survivors will be fitted for war, but not

Christ and War

necessarily for anything else. And further reflection shows that Darwin's law does not apply here at all. If the whole of a nation or the whole of its manhood, without distinction of age or strength, actively fought in its wars, and if the whole of the vanquished nation were killed, then Darwin's law would apply, but still only, be it noted, in producing fitness for war. For the strong and efficient warriors would survive, and they alone would be the fathers of succeeding generations, so that an increasing efficiency in war would presumably be insured. Whether such ever was the case in wars of remote antiquity may be left to antiquaries to decide. It is certainly now no longer the case. Under modern (and even ancient) conditions *the method of war results, not in the survival of the fittest, but in the survival of the least fit for war.* The chief reason for this is that only that part of a nation's manhood which is in the best condition physically is selected to take part in war. No man who is deformed, organically unsound, or even under-sized and weak is accepted as a recruit in any army. In France and Germany, where military service is compulsory, from 35 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the men of military age are rejected because they are not physically fit. In Great Britain a similar number of those who desire to enlist are also rejected for the same reason.¹

It has been very truly said, "Military selection occurs chiefly before the fighting even begins, and results in the temporary or permanent removal from the general population of a special part of it, and the deliberate exposure of this part to disease and death."² The effect of this *artificial* selection

¹ See an interesting article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1913, by Vernon L. Kellogg, entitled "Eugenics and Militarism."

² Above article; see also Novikow, "War," p. 23 ff.

Is it Impossible ?

is this : in the event of a war many of the strongest young men of the nations engaged are killed, many others crippled for life or weakened by disease ; while the weaklings and deformed who were rejected as unfit for military service remain alive. So that the effect of war on the population is at once to increase the proportion of physically inferior men. But its effects do not stop there. The weaklings who were rejected by the army are free to marry and have children, while many of the strongest who are killed or invalided home leave no posterity. *The generation that has been born during and soon after a war is then likely to be weaker and less virile than that born in normal times.* Statistics gathered from the official returns of the military authorities in various conscriptionist countries prove this to be a fact. Their records show that the average height of conscripts who were born during or just after wars is considerably less than those born in time of peace.

But, even if there be no war, the seclusion of young men in barracks has not in most cases a good effect upon them either physically or morally. The mortality in the army at home in times of peace is in most countries greater than that amongst the general population. This seems to be accounted for partly by the fact that barrack life is unnatural, and still more by the fact that there are certain diseases particularly prevalent in the army. These diseases are frequently passed on to the children of ex-soldiers, and are said to form one of the greatest causes of race-deterioration.¹ The statement often made that the physically undeveloped would in army training gain health and virility *might* be true if such were allowed to serve ; but, as we have seen, they are just the men that every army rejects.

¹ See Kellogg, *op. cit.*

Christ and War

To sum up, then. Far from war being a natural selective agency which makes for the advance of mankind, it is a form of artificial selection which works for race-deterioration. And the same is true generally, only to a less extent, of military life in barracks in time of peace. So that far from losing in physical efficiency by giving up war, it appears that we might reasonably hope to gain.

II. "War advances civilisation."

This is said to occur in two ways :—

- (a) Material prosperity is said to be increased by war.
- (b) War is said to be favourable to the development of art and literature.

(a) In the last chapter we saw that it is entirely erroneous to suppose that war can create wealth, and that in modern times it is practically impossible for one nation by war to appropriate the wealth of another. Without disputing the truth of these statements the advocates of war maintain that in the past war has often opened the way for advance in civilisation, and that it may do so in the future. Thus the Romans conquered all the countries round the Mediterranean and thereby made possible several centuries of peace and prosperity, such as the Western world had never before seen. Thus also, in part by war, Great Britain founded her vast and prosperous colonial empire. And Germany laid the foundations of her present greatness by a successful war with France. The general truth that war did play a part in advancing civilisation in the three cases instanced, and no doubt also in others, cannot be denied, but this neither proves that war was the one condition without which prosperity could not have come even in these cases, much less that it is likely to be a chief producer

Is it Impossible ?

of prosperity in the future. A consideration of the instances mentioned and a comparison of them with other conquests will throw further light on the question. Roman conquest was always a prelude to the introduction of a strong and just Government which secured peace for the State and safety of life and prosperity for the individual. In most cases the condition of things before conquest by the Romans was general war and anarchy ; they brought peace and good government. Their use of war cannot, therefore, be taken as a justification of war in general, but only of war which puts an end to war.¹

The war of the Balkan States against Turkey was hailed as an instance of war that puts an end to war. The constant pillaging and frequent massacres which appear to be a regular feature of Turkish rule were, so it was said, to be brought to an end by the terrible but necessary method of war. But the outcome has already shown us what serious disadvantages there are in war as a method of ending war ; for the victors fight over the spoil, and the Turk steps in and reconquers what had but now been wrested from him. Now at the present time the Turkish Empire is one of the very few places in the world where one would have

¹ But the peace founded on war which the Romans brought, while it probably was better than the anarchy which it often superseded, could not be a lasting peace ; for it did not develop self-government amongst its peoples, and in consequence there was under Roman control, on the one hand, a constant danger of insurrection on the part of the more vigorous people, who wished to control their own destinies, and, on the other hand, a progressive deterioration of those who apathetically submitted to be governed. Whether the present war (1914) will put an end to war remains to be seen. But even if it does, it is radically different from the Roman wars, because it was preceded by peace and decent government.

Christ and War

supposed that the Roman method of war to end war might have been used successfully. Does not the increase of difficulties in the Balkans show that even there it was an unsatisfactory method?

Turning now to the British Empire, much the same may be said of some of our wars as of the Roman wars; they put an end to war and brought peace and good government. But considerable portions of our Empire have been gained with very little war, and it is generally admitted that many of the wars which did take place might have been avoided by a wiser and juster treatment of native races.

The case of Germany is interesting. In 1870—71 Germany defeated France and became united. Since that time, being united, Germany has become strong and prosperous. But why was not Germany united before? Because each little German state had for long jealously guarded its sovereign rights, the chief of which were the privileges of making war and imposing tariffs.¹ While these were retained neither unity nor prosperity were possible. It was belief in the method of war which made war necessary to German unity. But it is the peace which followed the war which is the foundation of German prosperity. Had Germany, having vanquished France, started upon a career of conquest her prosperity would have been long in coming.²

But a consideration of some other nations throws further light on the relation of war and civilisation. Spain conquered a huge colonial empire in the sixteenth century. She used the method of war far more freely than Great Britain did. She gained great wealth through that empire, yet it neither

¹ These had both been considerably modified before 1870.

² See discussion of effects of war on Germany in "The Indemnity Futility," "The Great Illusion," pt. i., chap. vi.

Is it Impossible ?

brought her prosperity (she is to-day one of the poorest countries of Europe), nor were the colonies she founded either highly civilised or prosperous. (It is but in the last few years that life and property have begun to be safe in some of the South American states.)

Prosperity has not, then, always come to the states most successful in war ; and it has come to some that are by no means warlike. The United States had, until the last few years, no colonial empire and an insignificant army and navy. Its policy is, and always has been, peaceful, yet it is one of the most highly civilised and prosperous countries in the world.¹

May we not say that *war has in the past made for prosperity when, and only when, it opened the way for peaceful rule and beneficent commerce ?* If it could be shown that at the present time there were parts of the world where neither peace nor commerce could come without war, it would have to be allowed that war might in those places work beneficially. But to-day the whole world is open to commerce, and the vast majority of mankind love peace and already have it.²

(b) War is favourable to the development of art and literature. Probably Ruskin's lecture on War in "The Crown of Wild Olive" is the best statement of this view. He says in that lecture :—

"All the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war ; no great art ever yet arose on earth, but among a nation of soldiers. There is no art among a shepherd people, if it remains at peace. There is no art among an agricultural people, if it remains at

¹ It is also to be noted that the prosperity of some of the smaller European States, such as Switzerland, Holland and Belgium, is greater than that of Russia and Austria. It is trade not war which has brought prosperity—see "The Great Illusion," pt. i., chaps. iii. and v.

² This was written in 1913.

Christ and War

peace. Commerce is barely consistent with fine art ; but cannot produce it. Manufacture not only is unable to produce it, but invariably destroys whatever seeds of it exist. There is no great art possible to a nation but that which is based on battle " ("Crown of Wild Olive," par. 86).

(This is an extremely strong statement, and one would suppose that the man who made it would be a thorough-going defender of war. But Ruskin admits that three sorts of war do not make for advance in art and literature—

- (i) Barbarian invasion.
- (ii) The struggle of a peaceful nation for life ;
- (iii) Wars of ambition.

It is only wars of play ¹ and wars of self-defence which he believes to be ennobling. He then goes on to condemn nearly every circumstance of modern war. And it has been truly remarked that the rest of the lecture sounds more like an address delivered before the Peace Society than before a military audience.

Ruskin cannot, then, be claimed as an advocate of war in general. His approval of war is limited to ancient warfare, in which he has an artistic and antiquarian delight. Modern war, with its conscripts, its machine-guns, its capitalist basis he abhors. But it is modern war alone with which we are concerned. We cannot, if we would, go back to the hand-to-hand conflict of heroic times. Nevertheless Ruskin's contention that the best art and literature are in some way dependent on war is very disquieting to those who desire peace, though it can bring no comfort to the advocates of war, for it is clear that in his eyes modern war is even more debasing than peace. Is it true, then, that war encourages art ?

Now there can be no doubt that as war cannot

¹ Do wars of play ever occur nowadays ? Can there be wars of self-defence without wars of aggression ?

Is it Impossible ?

create wealth so it cannot create art. The history of all conquest is a history of the destruction both of material wealth and of the creations of art. And it is also obvious that no nation that puts all or most of its energies into war and war preparation can have the leisure to devote itself to art. The truth lying behind Ruskin's view seems to be that success in war and artistic achievement both spring from the same causes. The vigorous nations have to find an outlet for their energies. Sometimes this has taken the form of war, sometimes of creative art. Again, ancient war, with its hand-to-hand conflict, depended largely upon individual initiative ; and individuality is necessary to artistic achievement. But, while Ruskin was probably mistaken in maintaining that ancient war tended to develop artistic powers, his view that both modern commerce and manufacturing and modern war retard and destroy art is probably correct. And one cause of this depressing effect on art is the same in both cases. Both in war and in modern industrial life the individual is disregarded ; material things are valued more than men. Those who do rise above the crowd, do so on account of their efficiency in and concentration upon material and sordid matters, so that they are incapable of producing, and often even of appreciating, great art, while those who do not rise get little chance either to see or to produce anything truly artistic.

Modern war preparation and our modern commercial system, both by depressing the individual, prevent the rise of great art. Here, again, the problems of peace and war and modern social questions are nearly related.

But behind the erroneous idea that war can advance either material civilisation or art and literature lies the great truth that no great achievement can come without struggle ; struggle is abso-

Christ and War

lutely necessary both to the production of material things and to the development of the personality. Without struggle life becomes insipid and useless. In every walk of life the man who would do good work must struggle. But the struggle need not take the form of killing our fellow men.

III. "War is decreed by natural law." It is said "Men are naturally pugnacious and you can't alter human nature." But one of the reasons why some people at the present time are advocating universal military service is that men do not now love war, and it is increasingly difficult to get them to take part in it, and the same experience in other countries has already led to conscription.

It must be noted, too, when we speak of war being natural and say it is decreed by natural law, that our use of the term "Law" in this connection easily lends itself to misunderstanding and confusion in thought ; for "Law" is used in a variety of different senses, three of which it may be well to look at.¹

(a) Law in the sense of statements by the Government of a State as to what may or may not be done by its citizens. This is probably the original meaning of the word. Law of this kind can be broken, and certain punishments are imposed on those who break it.

(b) Connected with this is moral law. This is not by any means co-extensive with State law, nor necessarily closely connected with it. No punishments are attached to the breaking of it in the exterior way that is the case with State law. Nevertheless the two have in common that both are regulative of human conduct and both can be broken. But while State law demands obedience irrespective of the approval of the individual,

¹ For a much fuller discussion of this subject, see "The Passing of War," Chapter IV.

Is it Impossible ?

moral law has force over an individual only in so far as that individual recognises its right to determine his actions.

(c) Different from either is natural law. Only in the sense that it expresses a rule and uniformity is it called law at all. But this rule is no regulative decree imposed from without or approved within, but merely a fact that things happen in a certain sequence. Consequently it cannot be broken. If a sequence which has been taken for a natural law does not occur in certain circumstances, we cannot say that the law is broken, but only that our understanding of it was imperfect. Thus, if it were a natural law that men should fight, we should not find that so many have no desire to do any such thing. If many men do not want to fight, then war is no longer a natural law of humanity. It is mere confusion of thought to suppose it a sort of moral law by which war is decreed, as if it were required of man to fight. So, far from war being decreed by natural law, the vast majority of the people of Europe have no desire for war. They only submit to the vast expenditure on armaments which all European powers deem necessary because they are told that others are not as peaceful as they, and will certainly attack them if they are not armed to the teeth.

IV. "The moral effect of war is good."

It is maintained that without the bracing moral effects of war now and then men would get slack and luxurious, lazy and degenerate; they would become incapable of any heroic virtue or self-sacrifice in the interests of others. Mr. Strachey, in "A New Way of Life," emphasises this point very strongly (see especially pp. 9—30).¹

¹ It may be of interest to some who have been impressed with what has appeared in the papers about the great

Christ and War

To this fear of degeneracy many answers are possible. Amongst others it may be said that—(1) even if war does produce a bracing effect on a people, such effect is produced at great cost, not merely in treasure, which is a matter of secondary importance, but in life itself; and (2) that though it is a fact that many good moral qualities are produced in soldiers actually engaged in war, not one of such moral qualities is found so much more frequently in them than in the rest of the community as to justify us in the supposition that warfare and training for war alone can produce it. Perhaps of all such qualities heroism is most often taken as typical of the soldier, yet the heroism constantly displayed in such an occupation as coal-mining is equally great, and does not involve most of these things which we must reckon to the debit side of war. As an instance it will be remembered in the Cadeby pit disaster, in the summer of 1912, how out of the whole number of men killed, more than half had gone down after the first explosion to rescue their comrades, and were killed there by a second.

Obedience. It is often stated that implicit obedience is nowhere developed as it is in military life. This is no doubt true. A soldier must obey his superior officer promptly and without question. For the purposes of war such obedience is absolutely necessary. We admire the brave warrior devoted to his King and country who does not "reason why" but bravely goes to his death; and we do right to admire courage and self-forgetfulness. But we tend to forget the other side. In swearing implicit

united German nation enthusiastically devoting its men and treasure to schemes for the invasion of England to know that the writer has heard precisely similar complaints made by German military enthusiasts about the slackness and degeneracy of their people.

Is it Impossible?

obedience the soldier has surrendered his right of private judgment and his duty to follow the voice of conscience. He may absolutely disapprove a war—and the future may show him to have been right—yet it is his part only to obey. That is to say, in becoming a soldier he ceases to be a citizen.

And let it be remembered that in following the dictates of reason and conscience a man is obeying, or at any rate learning to recognise, the voice of God. Hence comes a fearful dilemma—as a soldier he must obey his officer, as a man he must obey God. It is idle to say that the dilemma is never actual. The very fact that dispassionate study of wars of the past shows that the causes in which they were waged were not always just (*e.g.*, the Crimea) proves that the voice of God commanded one thing, and that of the officer and of Government commanded another.

If it is a fact, as every Christian must recognise it to be, that a man as a man owes implicit obedience to God, it follows with absolute certainty that he cannot owe implicit obedience to man.¹

The good moral effects of war on those who take part in it are probably generally exaggerated, and

¹ A citizen as a citizen seldom has this dilemma presented to him. For the modern civilised State does not make such demands for implicit obedience. Its laws are mainly confined on the one hand to forbidding certain acts which the general consensus of enlightened opinion agrees are anti-social—its criminal law; and on the other to enjoining certain, in some cases rather arbitrary, regulations of action which will conduce to general good order—its civil and social law. The latter may be sometimes harassing, disagreeable, and to some minds unnecessary. (A man may dislike or disapprove of factory legislation or Insurance Acts.) But it is very seldom really contrary to the dictates of conscience to obey such rules. Whereas to take part actively in a war which he believes to be unjust must be against a man's conscience.

Christ and War

its very disastrous bad moral effects on the country that goes to war, seen in general brutalisation and lowering of ethical tone, are often overlooked. There is in the ordinary life of anyone who has to work hard ample opportunity for the cultivation of such virtues as self-control and moral courage, even if physical courage is only seldom called for.

V. "There are differences between nations which can be settled by no other means but by war." This is stated very plausibly in "A New Way of Life" by the editor of the *Spectator*, p. 35.

"Wars will and must continue because communities of men will always differ from each other upon many questions, and differ so fundamentally that they will not yield save to the only argument which all men admit to be unanswerable, the argument of proved superiority in physical force."

This is an often-used argument, but it really involves three fallacies—(i) the fallacy of arguing of communities as if they were individuals; (ii) the fallacy that force is an argument; (iii) the fallacy that the world is finally irrational.

(i) Communities are not individuals, and many phrases which we use of communities are deceptive from the fact that they properly apply only to individuals. The phrase used above is one of these. When a single individual holds strongly an opinion and another holds one incompatible with it the difference between them is indeed fundamental; for it may be said that the whole of each man is on this question opposed to the whole of the other. But, in the case of communities this does not occur. There are very marked and emphatic differences of opinion amongst the citizens of one country with regard to the questions at issue with another country. For example, before the Boer War there

Is it Impossible ?

was nothing approaching unanimity on the questions in dispute, either in this country or in the Transvaal. What unanimity there finally was in each country—and it was certainly always far from complete in England—was only produced after war had begun, and was due to a sentiment believed by many people to be patriotic, which induces men in the last resort to say, "My country, right or wrong!" We may confidently affirm that the progress of democracy has to such an extent advanced individual thought and opinion on international questions that such complete unity in a community with regard to their relations with another community is never likely to occur again in the civilised world.

(ii) That force is an argument. The fallacy of this statement is so obvious that it does not need pointing out. For the very essence of argument is an appeal to the reason. What, then, Mr. Strachey here means is evidently not argument in the true sense of the term, but something that does instead of argument. In other words, "proved superiority of physical force" makes a country think it wise to submit, but by no means alters the general opinion on the justice of the question in dispute. *What physical force has achieved, then, is by no means to settle the dispute, but merely indefinitely to postpone that settlement.*

(iii) And this leads us on to our third point. Mr. Strachey's reasoning involves the fallacy that the world is finally irrational; for, to resort in the final instance to force as the sovereign remedy implies either that we believe our adversary to be incapable of being moved by reason or that we ourselves are. Now while there may be individuals who are impervious to reason, States are not individuals, and there are in every nation many people

Christ and War

who wish their country to act rationally and earnestly work for that end.

VI. "Justice at times requires war." This may be treated under two heads.

(a) Justice to some oppressed community may require a strong nation to go to war on its behalf. Such noble self-sacrifice on the part of the strong nation for the weak and oppressed appeals to every high-minded person. It is the most honourable reason that any nation can have for going to war. But it must be admitted that great nations have but seldom gone to war to protect the weak. Many people wanted Great Britain to go to war with Turkey to protect the Armenians when the horrible massacres were taking place. She did not do so, though she had by treaty the right to protect them. Fear of international complications made her refrain from making war. If by attacking Turkey in that just cause she had involved half Europe in war, would not the remedy have been worse than the disease? But why should one great power going to war with Turkey lead to a general European war? There is only one answer possible. The powers of Europe are jealous and afraid of one another. The cause of this jealousy and fear is the presence of war preparation and the possibility of war. Had that not kept the powers of Europe apart and encouraged mutual distrust, they could unitedly, without war, have insisted on proper government and religious toleration in Turkey.

War may perhaps sometimes succeed in putting an end to oppression, but it is a dangerous weapon, frequently doing more harm than good. On the other hand, a union of the great powers of Europe in the interests of peace and justice could easily put an end to oppression without resorting to war. Would not, therefore, a truer expression of

Is it Impossible ?

self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of freedom and justice be found in giving up petty jealousy and promoting the federation of the world than in using the uncertain and dangerous method of war ?

(b) Justice may require war to be waged on behalf of our own nation. At first sight, seeing that we have found reasons to doubt the righteousness of going to war to protect others, it would seem that there is even less reason to do it in our own interest. But in "Conservatism" Lord Hugh Cecil gives reasons for doing so which must be met. On p. 202 he says : "Some good men seem inclined to maintain that the action of the State towards other States ought to be the same as the action of an individual to other individuals. . . ." He goes on : "No one has a right to be unselfish in other people's interests. It is the business of every ruler to exact to the uttermost every claim which can both justly and wisely be made on behalf of his country. He is in a position of a trustee of the interests of others, and must be just and not generous."

Now what Lord Hugh Cecil says here raises two questions.

The first is, Can the ruler of a State be unprejudiced in deciding questions at issue between citizens of his own State and foreigners ? He is certainly the trustee for the interests of his own people and must endeavour to see that they obtain justice. But the very fact that he is their trustee prevents him seeing the question from all sides and thus makes it impossible for him himself to act as judge. The case of a nation making war on behalf of its own citizens is, then, very different from that of a strong nation going to war to protect the weak. In the latter case the strong nation may be unprejudiced

Christ and War

and therefore in the position to act as judge ; in the former it cannot be unprejudiced.

But even in cases where there is no doubt that an outrage has been committed on his people by a foreign State a second question remains to be answered. Can the ruler by going to war *inflict punishment on the persons responsible for the outrage and on those alone?* Consider the following :—

(a) The result of war is quite uncertain. If in the end his own country is defeated, the ruler who makes war for justice will find that his efforts after justice have only resulted in worse injustice.

(b) Even if the war is successful, the damage done to life and property in the nation seeking justice has been enormous and is all additional to the first injustice done to it. The nation, therefore, has gained nothing, but lost heavily.

(c) But it will be said revenge has been taken on the offender. The unjust nation has been punished. True, but what comfort is it to the widows and orphans of one country that there are more widows and orphans in another country? What comfort is it to ruined manufacturers and starving artisans that in the defeated country there are more people ruined and starving? And who have suffered in each country? Not by any means necessarily those who inflicted the original wrong, but large numbers of perfectly unoffending people. It seems, then, more than doubtful if justice ever can require war, (i) because the nation that goes to war on its own behalf cannot be unprejudiced and therefore is not likely to be just; (ii) because war is such a clumsy and dangerous weapon that it is quite unfitted to be the minister of justice. It may perhaps be objected that this is simply a counsel of despair; it is saying in effect, "Justice between

Is it Impossible ?

nations cannot be obtained." But this is only looking at half the facts. It is quite true that justice cannot be obtained by war, for even if the nation that is most in the right wins, it does not win *because* it is in the right, as was pointed out in Chapter V. (see p. 108), and the price of its victory has been a vast amount of undeserved suffering—that is, injustice. But those who desire disarmament and peace between the nations desire also justice, and wish to see instituted between the nations arbitration, which alone can secure that justice. The great obstacle to the unimpeded use of arbitration at the present time is the war tradition, by which a method of settling disputes which is not rational, and can only by chance give victory to the right, is held up as particularly sacred and honourable.¹

VII. "Were all civilised powers to disarm the civilised world would be at the mercy of barbarian hordes, who might overrun Europe again as they did in the latter days of the Roman Empire."

This objection to disarmament does not take into account certain facts of modern civilisation which make it very different from that of Roman times. The Roman Empire, even at its zenith, comprised but a small portion of the land of the globe. To the Roman and Greek of that day it alone was the *οἰκουμένη*, the inhabited world. All beyond was

¹ It has not been considered necessary to discuss the cases of wars of liberation. It is not denied that there have been such in the past, nor that they have brought good. But this book is written in English, and no English-speaking people needs to wage war for its liberty. Such wars are secondary. *There could be no opportunity for wars of liberation if there had not been wars of aggression.* By abolishing all war and setting up courts of arbitration all necessity for wars of liberation will have gone. (See "The Passing of War," chap. xiii., 3rd ed.)

Christ and War

unknown and peopled by barbarians, who were scarcely recognised as being fellow-men at all. At the present day the British Empire alone is much larger than the Roman Empire was, and Great Britain is only one amongst a number of large and powerful nations which share in a common civilisation and whose possessions cover three-quarters of the land of the globe.

The explorers and travellers of these nations have penetrated into every country on the face of the earth, have surveyed it, and written books about it, describing its people and their customs, its animals and plants. And now in the remotest parts of Africa and Asia traders belonging to the civilised races are bartering goods made in England and Germany for the natural products of those far-off lands, and Christian missionaries have followed hard after the explorer and now are preaching the Gospel to tribes whose existence was never dreamt of a century ago. So that instead of the civilised world consisting of a small collection of provinces around an inland sea, all speaking one or two languages and owing allegiance to one emperor, and these provinces surrounded on almost every side by unknown lands, peopled by nomadic tribes, to-day it consists of some hundreds of large States, some independent, some united together in various ways; governed by kings, presidents, viceroys, councils, senates and parliaments; speaking a host of different languages. And these States cover at least three-quarters of the land of the globe. Here and there there are still nomadic tribes, but instead of their surrounding civilisation, civilisation hems them in on every side.

Barbarian inroads on any large scale are, therefore, no longer possible. But it may be objected, it is not barbarians we fear—the utterly uncivilised

Is it Impossible?

are both few and weak, and could not do any great harm to the civilised nations—it is rather such nations as the Japanese and Chinese and the peoples of India who might attack an unarmed Europe. Their civilisation is lower, or at any rate vastly different from ours, yet they have learnt from us so much mechanical and natural science that if we were to disarm they could easily invade our countries and destroy our people and property.

Now it is true that if we were to disarm, these nations would very quickly *be able* to destroy our civilisation. But why should they do so? What good would it do them? They may not be quite our equals in civilisation, but there are plenty of people amongst them who would recognise that nothing would be gained by such action. There is only one thing which would be likely to prompt the nations of the East to undertake such a piece of folly, and that is *revenge*. It is a fact that we, the nations of the West, have not always done right by these weaker peoples. There have been a great many cases where our treatment of them has been harsh and unjust and even cruel. *It is possible that they might desire revenge.*

If, then, the motive of revenge is likely to produce some such attack, we have indeed something to fear from them. *But disarmament is not more likely to give the opportunity for such an attack than is the present race of armaments.* For at present the Western nations arm against one another, and a quarrel between them might lead to war. Then when we were weakened by war there would be an excellent opportunity for the Eastern nations to attack us, and what resistance could we offer?

Or again, even if war does not come between the nations of Europe, the nations of the East are already copying our military and naval preparations.

Christ and War

At present they are too poor to rival us, but they are getting richer, and they have a far larger population. If China with her four hundred millions were to become a military nation, her army would be vastly larger than that of any other people. So that *if we still continue the insane race of armaments and the nations of the East enter it, as they are already beginning to do, within a short time Europe will in any case be faced with the possibility of an Asiatic invasion.*

Here, then, is our choice. Are we to take the method of rivalry and war, which is morally certain to lead to our ruin? Or are we, while yet there is time, to take the rational way of peace, conciliation, and mutual understanding which material advantage, humanity, and true Christianity unite in approving?

VIII. "War simply springs from human passion, which cannot be controlled by religion, reason or expediency. War, therefore, cannot be abolished."

Every Christian must believe that a change is possible in man, that a man can come under the control of Jesus Christ, and, by His spirit, conquer evil passion in himself. Therefore if, apart from Christianity, there is any truth in this contention, it forms another call to Christians to bring the power of the Gospel to ever-increasing numbers of people. But while it may be a fact that human passion does not change, experience shows that the methods by which it expresses itself may be entirely altered. The development of character in an individual consists, very largely, in the conscious or unconscious control of passion, so that its action ministers to the general welfare of the whole personality. And may not the same be true of nations? Undoubtedly when a nation is injured or insulted the passion of resentment rises up in its people and moves them towards revenge. But the voice of reason is

Is it Impossible ?

not silent, and it may suggest that after all the injury done was slight, and not worth going to war about ; or that possibly it was done unintentionally, and the aggressor may be willing to make restitution ; or that, after all, even if the injury was intentional and of a serious character, war is an irrational method of obtaining justice, and can only bring loss to both sides.

These considerations may not at once stifle the passion of resentment, but they will, if wisely urged by those who desire to keep the peace, avail to prevent resentment expressing itself in war ; and meanwhile courteous, diplomatic negotiations or arbitration may lead the way to a really just settlement and restore friendly feelings between the two nations. This is exactly what took place during the Russo-Japanese War, when the Russian fleet fired on English fishing boats. Excitement was great in England. Many people openly advocated war. It was an "outrage," "an act of war," "something that could only be wiped out in blood." Passion was fiercely aroused. But fortunately the voice of reason was also heard ; it was indicated that there must have been a mistake ; that this was a case where negotiation and arbitration could be of use. An international commission of inquiry was formed, as provided for by the Hague Conference. It was decided that the Russian fleet had been in the wrong, whereupon compensation was agreed upon and paid. Contrast this result with what would have happened had the war party had their way. War could not have restored the dead fishermen to their friends, but it would have bereaved thousands of other homes in England (not to mention Russia), and would have left a feeling of bitterness and hatred on both sides which might have lasted many years.

Christ and War

But there is a certain grain of truth in the idea that human passion is unchangeable. It is this: man has undoubtedly certain elementary instincts shared to a greater or less degree by all animals, one of which is the instinct to guard himself and his dependents from danger; and another is to possess himself of things that he desires. The interplay of these two instincts has in the past produced war. One man or tribe desires what another possesses and attempts to seize it; the other tries to keep it; and war ensues.

But the main cause of man's advance from a level but little above that of the beasts to civilisation is that he has controlled his instincts by reason. The desire to take what belongs to someone else has often been controlled by the knowledge that the attempt to take it is likely to result in the loss of possessions already gained.

So also when the passion of revenge urges a nation towards war, reason, humanity, and religion may restrain it by showing that war can only bring material and moral loss. The certainty that material loss would in particular cases result has often made nations restrain their passions. As man develops and reason and religion get a stronger hold upon him, this restraint which has been exercised in particular cases will be exercised at all times where there is a temptation to make war, because it will be realised that war always brings both moral and material loss. The instinct of self-preservation and the instinct of getting what one wants will remain, but instead of taking the unsuccessful method of war they will find rational and just means of gaining their ends.

So also in the case of the very valuable instinct of "pugnacity." The desire to fight has in the past been a fruitful source of war. But war does not

Is it Impossible ?

bring any satisfaction to certain other sides of man's character. It is destructive, not constructive, and man desires to make something that will endure. But when this pugnacity, this joy in struggle is turned into useful channels, to overcoming natural difficulties, to conquering disease, to championing good but unpopular causes, in general to overcoming what stands in the way of human improvement, the greatest good results, not only to the fighter himself, but to humanity. The heroes of the future will not be those who have destroyed their fellows, but those who have improved the lot of mankind—inventors, engineers, physicians, nurses, missionaries, and religious and social reformers. They are the true warriors who engage in the holy war for the coming of the Kingdom of God. That war in which we are all called to take our share involves no destruction of men, but the destruction of evil ; no conquest of nations, but the conquest of self.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

" The Great Illusion," part ii.

" Passing of War," chaps. iii. and iv.

" War or Peace," chap. i.

" Passing of War," chap. xiii. (only in later ed.).

And pamphlet—

" Modern Wars and the Peace Ideal," by Norman Angell.

CHAPTER VII

REASON *VERSUS* FORCE

IN this chapter certain positive reasons will be given for believing that war can be abolished and international life organised upon a basis of perpetual peace. They are the following :—

I. Personal violence plays a gradually decreasing part in human life.

II. War itself is already playing a decreasing part in international affairs.

III. The world is no longer divided in interests according to its division into nations. The modern division is according to class. War, therefore, is an anachronism.

IV. A substitute for war is in existence. Both theoretically and practically *Arbitration* is more efficient than war.

I. Personal violence plays a decreasing part in human life.

If the foundation of all law and order were force (in the sense of physical force exerted by persons upon persons), as is sometimes maintained, man could never have risen above the level of the beasts, and would have assuredly not have been even the highest of the beasts, for he is by no means the strongest or best endowed with natural weapons of attack and defence. His superiority to the beasts has been from the first conditioned by two qualities, neither of them capable of expression in terms of

Reason *versus* Force

physical force, namely: (a) Mental power, by which, through intelligent foresight, making plans and devising tools, he has been able to do with comparatively little labour things entirely beyond his own unaided powers, or those of the strongest animals. (b) Moral power. Men, by loyalty to one another, which has made possible mutual dependence and helpfulness, have been able collectively to progress as they never could have progressed singly.

It is these two qualities which are distinctive of man, and it is they that have made civilisation possible. The difference between civilised man and savage man is not that the former is stronger physically than the latter. He is very frequently by no means so strong (even his superiority in war depends on mental and moral qualities). It is that the former can use tools and people to much better advantage. But physical force has not fallen into disuse. Modern civilised man has learnt to make use of forces never dreamt of by primitive man, and it is the development of the intellectual and moral rather than the physical side of his nature that has enabled him to do so. But this development of his intellectual and moral nature has made man increasingly see that *the controlling force in man is not physical*. And he has, therefore, in dealing with people, increasingly substituted mental and moral suasion for physical force.

The fact that physical force is of but little use in dealing with people has only slowly been grasped by mankind, but that it is already very largely superseded by argument and moral force is shown by the consideration of four instances.

(i) Slavery has almost entirely disappeared from the modern world. There seem to be two reasons for its disappearance:—

Christ and War

- (a) It became recognised that man as man had rights. He could not be a mere chattel under the absolute control of another.
- (b) It was found that free labour was really more economical. For the free man took an intelligent interest in his work, and so did it better.

Now both of these reasons depend on the fact that physical force is giving way to mental and moral force. For the recognition that a man has rights is nothing less than the recognition that argument and moral suasion must be used with him rather than physical force. And that free labour is better than forced shows that mind and heart, as well as mere physical strength, are requisite for good work.

(ii) The use of torture. One hundred and fifty years ago torture was still in use in most European countries. It was the regular practice in most parts of the Continent to use torture in criminal proceedings. If there was not enough evidence to convict a prisoner, but suspicion against him was strong, he was stretched on the rack in order to extort a confession. If a prisoner was convicted, but accomplices were suspected, he was tortured to make him give their names. This was done under the delusion that torture would make a man necessarily speak the truth; but there must have been numbers of persons who, to escape the agony, incriminated innocent persons, or confessed to crimes they had never committed. The Roman Catholic Church was particularly addicted to the use of torture to induce heretics to recant. It appears that ecclesiastics really supposed that bodily pain might alter a man's convictions!

But in the latter half of the eighteenth century men came to see that such use of physical force on

Reason *versus* Force

persons did not succeed in what it was intended to do. It could neither insure truth-speaking, nor could it change a man's opinions. So physical force gave way, on the one hand to more careful weighing of evidence, and on the other to argument and moral suasion.¹

(iii) Methods of punishment.

Throughout Europe, almost to the end of the eighteenth century, crime was punished with a fierceness and cruelty which we can scarcely imagine at the present day. In England, where punishment was on the whole more humane than elsewhere, the most petty thefts were punished with death; branding and mutilation were common, and prisons were loathsome places where disease was rampant. But instead of checking crime, this harshness appears to have had the effect of increasing it. Crimes of violence were vastly more common at that time than now. Though highway robbery was punishable by death, every road was infested with highwaymen, and neither life nor property was safe.

But in these instances, when people began to substitute moral and intellectual means of attacking crime for physical, it began to diminish. The laws were altered, punishment was made more humane, branding and mutilation were abolished, and capital punishment gradually limited to cases of murder only. It began to be recognised that the aim of punishment was not revenge, but prevention of crime. And slowly it is now beginning to dawn on statesmen that an even higher aim is the reform of criminals; and as this idea is put into practice we may confidently expect to see a further substitution of moral force for physical, and a further improvement of the general condition of the nation.

¹ For further interesting information on this subject the reader is referred to "The Arbiter in Council," pp. 228—254.

Christ and War

(iv) Methods of education.

Physical force used to play a very great rôle in education. In our great-grandfathers' school days the average boy received constant thrashings. His lessons were thrashed into him and his faults were thrashed out of him ; at least, so it was supposed. Yet many men who received such an education still remained quite as ignorant and vicious as those who have experienced only the gentler system of the present generation. And there is no doubt that such brutal methods of education tended to blunt the feelings and thus to retard true progress. The aim of education is to develop the character and supply useful knowledge. No doubt this was recognised one hundred years ago as fully as it is to-day, but the practice of educationalists in those days leads one to suppose that they thought physical suffering would purify the moral nature and open the mind. Experience has shown us that in numberless cases it has had precisely the reverse effect, and nowadays educationalists endeavour to work directly upon the minds and hearts of their pupils, instead of taking a circuitous route through their bodies. As a consequence of this, corporal punishment has almost disappeared from most schools, and punishment of any sort occupies a very secondary place. The result has been a generally higher level of intelligence, and a better moral tone.

In all these cases the use of moral and intellectual force instead of physical has resulted in benefits to mankind generally, benefits, be it noted, not merely intellectual and moral, but also material. And there seems every reason to believe that the true progress of mankind involves further elimination of the use of physical force on persons, and further developments in the use of mental and moral force.

Reason *versus* Force

Advance in this direction will sooner or later involve the abolition of war.

II. War itself already plays a less important rôle in the world than formerly. The wars of the nineteenth century have been fewer, and the periods of peace longer, than has been the case in any previous century since the break-up of the Roman Empire.

Wars of religion in the sixteenth century (to go no further back), wars of aggression and dynastic wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, left Europe but few years of peace, and those always troubled with an only too well grounded fear of war. But the nineteenth century, after a terrible opening in the Napoleonic wars, was mainly a time of peace, broken now and then, it is true, by conflicts; but these have been, compared with wars of the past, both few and short.

This comparatively-speaking peaceful state of affairs has been due to a number of facts of modern life, each of which is in itself a promise for the future. These facts are all quite familiar to us, yet we do not always realise what they imply. They may conveniently be divided into two sets:—

(i) Causes of war which are now no longer operative.

(ii) Circumstances of modern life which directly make for peace.

(i) Wars of ambition or personal aggrandisement are now universally condemned, and it is not likely that such will again take place unless their real cause can be hidden under some plea of justice and self-defence.¹ No one now thinks wars of religion possible, yet the sixteenth century was full of them. Dynastic wars, too, are out of date,

¹ Justice and self-defence are urged by the belligerents on *both sides* in the present war (1914).

Christ and War

yet the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries might have been almost as peaceful as the nineteenth if it had not been for them. So many boundary disputes have in the last century been decided without war, that it seems improbable that such will lead to war again.

In place of these causes which have led to wars in the past the nineteenth century saw wars of liberation (as, for instance, in Italy); wars for the consolidation of a nation (as, for instance, those of Prussia, which aided in the formation of the modern German Empire); and a few which masqueraded under better titles than they deserved, such as the Crimean and the South African Wars. The same causes which helped to put an end to the one set of wars helped to bring about the other. The recognition of the value of the individual and the aspiration after national unity, which came chiefly into prominence in the nineteenth century, both emphasised aspects of human life hitherto insufficiently recognised. Compared with them the ambition of rulers, differences of religion, and dynastic uncertainties seemed of small moment. But freedom, good government, and national solidarity appeared to be the greatest of human needs; and several wars of the nineteenth century were undertaken to make these possible.

It may be said, "But will not wars for liberation and national unity occur again?" Yes, they may continue to occur, until all nations are free and have achieved national unity, provided that it is external interference which prevents them attaining those ideals. Then they must cease. But it is unlikely that even these causes can lead to many wars in the future, because national solidarity and liberty have already been attained by most nations, and where such is not yet the case it is by no means clear that

Reason *versus* Force

war is likely in future to be an efficient means of advancing such causes. Education and political action are of far more value at the present day.

But when nations have gained liberty and national unity by war they have only begun to realise the ideal that these words stand for. Only by constant endeavour to perfect the machinery of government and to advance the best interests of the people can such liberty and unity be preserved. And this implies a transference of attention from war and war preparation to the inner affairs of making and administering just laws.

Therefore the fact that the ideals of liberty and national unity in the nineteenth century caused some wars gives us reason to expect, not so much that more wars will arise from the same cause, as that the preoccupation of men's minds with such ideals will turn their energies into the development of progressively better and juster forms of government. And this is what we now see happening in all the more advanced nations. We may then say that some of the most fruitful causes of war in the past have disappeared, and their place has been taken by ideals which have indeed in certain cases led to war, but which for their full realisation require above all things peace.

(ii) But not only have ancient causes of war largely ceased to be operative; there are circumstances at the present time which positively make for peace, *and their power is constantly increasing.*

(a) The commercial and financial unity of the world makes it to the interest of nearly everyone engaged in trade to preserve peace. It was shown in Chapter V. that war could bring no gain, but only financial loss, to both parties concerned, and indeed to the whole of the commercial world. But the commercial unity of the world makes for peace in

Christ and War

an even more direct way than that. It produces familiarity and friendship between men of different races.¹ The English manufacturer frequently has agents and customers in Germany with whom in many cases he is on terms of real friendliness, and with whom he has more real common interest than with his rival and competitor in England. In the commercial world differences of race are of little moment ; mutual profit is what is sought, and this can never come by cutting one another's throats.

(b) Just as there is real unity of interest between commercial and financial houses of different nations, so there is unity of interest between the workers of those nations. The labourers and artisans of the civilised world realise that they are united in aim. They all make the same complaint, that they do not get an adequate share of the good things of life. They all have the same desire—greater security of employment and a fuller life. The interests of the working men of England are identical with those of their comrades in France and Germany, and the bettering of conditions in one country will certainly tend to their improvement in the others. Where there is no opposition of interest there should be no enmity, and the working classes are rapidly recognising this. Whoever may gain by war, the workers always suffer.

The identity of interest between the workers of different nations is a fact which is constantly brought before our eyes in international labour conferences and the international organisation of Socialism. It is true that many working men still do not recognise it, and as long as this is the case it may be possible to

¹ This friendliness may be considered a sentimental bulwark against war, of no avail against the solid reasons for war. But all solid reasons for war have gone, only sentiment is left.

Reason *versus* Force

work up hatred and war fever. But the education of working-class opinion is proceeding very rapidly, and the time is probably not far distant when men will no longer be gulled by the obsolete catch words of the war-maker.¹

(c) The unity of science. All scientific advance is the property of the whole world. Competition there may be between scientists of different countries, but it is a friendly rivalry which coexists with the utmost goodwill and mutual respect. Every branch of science has its international congresses; and scientific investigators in the same field are colleagues and friends the world over.

(d) At the present day the desire for peace is shared by practically every class in all civilised nations. Not only is it recognised that peace is essential to prosperity, but war itself is regarded as a positive evil. So that we find even those in every nation who most strongly insist on huge military and naval establishments do so because they consider such are a guarantee of peace.

All these influences making for peace were felt in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and have steadily gained in strength; and so far as we can see they are likely to still further advance the cause of peace in the twentieth century.

III. The cross division of society.

Closely related with the last subject discussed, is

¹ Lord Roberts, whom personally we must all honour, though we disagree with him, in his Manchester speech, 25th October, 1912, maintained that "patriotism" would override this sense of the unity of interest amongst the workers in different countries. But a patriotism which insists on fighting when it has been demonstrated that there is nothing to be gained by fighting, and when it is realised that war is contrary both to humanitarian sentiment and Christian ethics, is not love of one's country, but arrant folly (written, 1913).

Christ and War

the fact that nowadays the various classes in each nation are realising their solidarity with the corresponding classes in other nations. Throughout the whole history of mediæval and modern Europe princes and nobles recognised their solidarity. They had more in common with each other than with their own retainers and subjects, and they knew it. Ruling families and noble houses in different nations intermarried with one another and refused to recognise as valid marriages contracted with persons of lower rank in the same nation.

But to-day this solidarity has extended to every class of society. It shows itself in a general sense of community of interest between persons of similar occupation in the different nations. Not only does the capitalist of one country recognise his unity of interest with the capitalist of another, but we may even go so far as to say that capital is already organised on an international scale. It goes where it is wanted with very little regard to national sentiment. Many great manufacturing houses have branch works in several different countries.

In the same way labour is becoming united the world over.

But not only is each class in every country becoming conscious of its solidarity with the corresponding class in other countries ; it is also tending to emphasise its opposition of interest to other classes in its own country. Thus capital and labour stand opposing one another in all Western nations. For the real clash of interests is now no longer between nations, but between classes.

War, therefore, should be abolished, for the very reason for its existence has practically disappeared. The struggle has passed over to another sphere of life, in which, while there is, unfortunately, all too much of the spirit of war, the methods of war are

Reason *versus* Force

worse than useless.¹ War is for modern industrial society simply an anachronism.

IV. A substitute for war has already been established and extensively used.

As was pointed out in Chapter VI. (p. 145), arbitration is the rational method of settling disputes between nations, just as arbitration (generally in the form of an action at law) is the rational method between individuals. It is not generally realised how many disputes between nations have already been satisfactorily settled by arbitration. *During the nineteenth century two hundred and twelve arbitral awards were made; not one of these was repudiated by either side in the dispute.*² While some of these disputes were about matters of but slight importance, which, perhaps, had they remained unsettled, would scarcely have led to war, others were of very serious character indeed, which had already brought the countries involved to the very verge of war.

At least twice in the past fifty years arbitration has saved Great Britain and the United States from a fratricidal war. Both in the case of the

¹ It would be too much of a digression to discuss extensively whether the "class war," as it is called, is likely to be in the future as serious an evil as war between nations has been in the past. But one thing seems certain, if arbitration can bring to a just settlement disputes between nations, as it has done in large numbers of cases, there is no reason why arbitration in industrial disputes should not rapidly replace the strike and lockout. And the abolition of war will almost certainly hasten the coming of more peaceful methods in settling industrial disputes.

² See Perris, "History of War and Peace," chap. xi., p. 240.

In eight cases some dissatisfaction was expressed by one party, and the case was re-tried and amicably settled. In no case has war, or even bitterness, resulted from arbitration. (See pamphlet "International Arbitration Procedure," W. Evans Darby, Peace Society, 1913.)

Christ and War

Alabama claims, settled in 1872, and the Venezuela intervention, settled in 1896, passion in both countries had been raised to such a pitch that war seemed imminent. Fortunately each time wiser counsels prevailed and arbitration gave a just award.¹ Not only have there been a large number of cases of arbitration in the past hundred years, but, even more important, over three hundred arbitration treaties have been signed between the various nations. Some of these only apply to disputes arising from certain specified sources of difficulty. Others apply to all disputes provided they do not touch matters of national honour, an exception which somewhat reduces their effective power. Chile and Argentina have the honour of being the first nations to agree to submit *without exception all disputes* that should arise between them to arbitration. In 1900 a dispute about the boundary had excited passion on both sides and seemed about to lead to war, when two bishops, one in Argentina and another in Chile, began to preach peace, pleading with their people not to make war on their brothers. Their efforts were successful in stemming the tide of passion. Both countries agreed to arbitration, and King Edward VII., the Peacemaker, was asked to arbitrate; his award when it came was loyally accepted by both parties; but even before that, in 1902, an agreement for limitation of armaments had been drawn up. In 1903 the first unlimited arbitration treaty was signed between Argentina and Chile, and this was fittingly commemorated by the erection on a point high up in the Andes where the two countries join, of a colossal statue of Christ, cast from old cannon. An inscrip-

¹ For an interesting account of these, and of Anglo-American relations generally, see H. S. Perris, "Pax Britannica," pp. 275—285.)

Reason *versus* Force

tion on its base reads " Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentina and Chile break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

Have not these two South American republics set an example that all the world ought to follow ?

Though difficulties have prevented the completion of such unlimited treaty between any two of the great powers, efforts have been made in that direction which may within a short time be successful. In 1911, at the instigation of President Taft, with the cordial assent of Sir Edward Grey and the acclamation of statesmen of all parties in England, an unlimited arbitration treaty was signed at Washington between Great Britain and the United States. This was to have been the precursor of similar treaties of the United States and the other great powers. Unfortunately the Senate of the United States by a narrow majority refused to accept the treaty. But public opinion in both countries is rapidly ripening for such a treaty. It would be a fitting culmination of a century of peace between the two great English-speaking nations. Since the Treaty of Ghent, 1814, the centenary of which is to be celebrated next year, there has been no war between the two great divisions of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the disputes which might have led to war having in every case been settled peacefully by arbitration and negotiation, have only served to strengthen the ties of friendship between the sister nations. Not only so, but Great Britain and the United States were parties to the first treaty ever signed for limitation of armaments.¹ In 1815 Monroe, the American Secretary of State, proposed that there should be no armed forces on either side of the United States-

¹ See H. S. Perris, " Pax Britannica," pp. 267—270.

Christ and War

Canadian frontier. In 1817 the Rush-Bagot agreement was drawn up, by which Monroe's proposal was made effective, and from that time to this that frontier, of 3,000 miles in length, is without fort or garrison on either side, and there can be no doubt that this absence of armed forces has greatly contributed to the peace between the two nations.

The nineteenth century saw a great advance in international agreement, and its last decade witnessed the first successful attempt to draw all nations together in an international conference for the limitation of armaments and the substitution of arbitration for war. In 1899 the first Hague Conference met. Since that time, while no success has yet attended the efforts after general limitation of armaments, the cause of arbitration has prospered wonderfully. The cases tried by the Hague Tribunal itself have been only twelve (to the end of 1912), but these are only a small proportion of the total number of disputes satisfactorily settled by arbitration since 1900, for in most cases the nations involved have preferred to choose their own arbitrators.

But the Hague Conferences have only begun to do their work. Natural conservatism has viewed limitation of armaments with great suspicion, and the interests that live on armaments in all countries have used their great influence to cause an increase rather than a decrease in military and naval preparation. Nevertheless, public opinion is being educated. At the first Hague Conference, in 1899, twenty-six States were represented; at the second, in 1907, forty-four were represented; and preparations are being made in all civilised countries for the third in 1915, which show that both the Governments and people are taking it

Reason *versus* Force

seriously and mean that it shall influence international life.¹

At the present time the numerous cases satisfactorily settled by arbitration and the great number of arbitration treaties in existence, show that the nations generally are willing to submit to arbitration such questions as the interpretation of treaties and disputes about boundaries, but that they are not yet generally willing to submit questions touching what is called national honour. It seems that while between individuals the duel is recognised as a foolish and entirely unsatisfactory way of settling a quarrel, it is still thought that between nations an insult can only be wiped out in blood. But there is no rational justification for such a view; for the sovereign rights of a State which it is supposed would be surrendered by submission of such questions to arbitration are not rights over other States, but only over its own citizens. Now that all the machinery of arbitration is ready for use, and hundreds of awards have been made and accepted as just, we may believe that the time is not far distant when nations will be willing unrestrictedly to submit all disputes to impartial tribunals. It may be asked at this point, "If all these indications of influences making for peace are to be observed, why is it that we still constantly have the fear of war?"

The answer is twofold:—(i) War has for so long occupied a large place in human life that it is difficult to believe that it can be abolished—so difficult that, until people have studied the subject, the proposition appears perfectly ridiculous. It is, as Professor Novikow says, simply "routine thinking" that makes men think war necessary. "In reality, the civilised people of to-day conduct wars simply

¹ This was written in 1913.

Christ and War

because their savage ancestors did so of old. There is no other reason. It is a case of pure atavism, a survival, a routine."¹ But this pathetic belief that war cannot be entirely avoided is combined in the minds of most modern men with a sincere love of peace and some realisation of the horrors and evils of war. The result is that while they will not agree to abolish the means of war, so making war impossible, they heartily wish to avoid any particular war which threatens.

(ii) The present race of armaments tends to keep the nations of Europe in constant expectation of an attack. *Each of the great powers looks upon its own military and naval expenditure as purely for defence, but regards that of others as intended for attack.* It is a platitude in Great Britain that our navy is intended to secure the peace of the world; but we look with disfavour, and even dread, at Germany's growing navy, for we consider it a menace to the world's peace, and suppose that it is being increased with a view of attacking us. Yet in Germany it is looked upon simply as a means of defence—another security for the world's peace. It is a fact that the average German, during the last few years, had no desire to attack Great Britain, but believed that Great Britain was watching for a favourable moment to attack Germany, just as in England the belief was that Germany was going to attack us. Thus both countries rapidly increased their naval establishment. Each thought the other meant offence, but knew that its own intention was only defence. So that to-day, with vastly increased annual naval expenditure, neither is in the least more secure than she was ten years ago.

How does this race of armaments originate? There are people in both countries who can make

¹ Novikow, "War," p. 88.

Reason *versus* Force

profit out of the fears of their fellow-countrymen. Newspapers that publish sensational reports can frequently greatly extend their circulation thereby. And, seeing that in all countries there are a few irresponsible people who profess to desire war, and journals that cater for such people, it is always possible by selecting the speeches and writings of this fire-eating minority for publication in another country to give the impression that feeling is generally hostile.

But perhaps an even more serious cause of the increase of armaments is the enormous financial interest involved in the production of war material. It is not necessary here to go into details of how the armament combines cause the nations to increase their "defences." That has been recently shown up both in England and Germany.¹

But it is well for us to remember that while such an enormous amount of capital is invested in the trade of war preparation there will be very strong pressure brought to bear on Governments to increase, or at all events not to reduce, their armaments. There is no reason to suppose that these armament firms desire war, but they know that war scares bring grist to their mill.

In the peace movement, as in so many other movements for the benefit of mankind, one of the chief obstacles to be faced is vested interest. It is not likely that men who are engaged in the manufacture of war material will readily allow themselves or other people to believe that disarmament is possible. Nor will those classes who look upon the army and navy as almost the only possible careers

¹ See pamphlet issued by the *Daily News and Leader*, "How War Scares are made," *id.*; pamphlet issued by the *Labour Leader*, "The War Trust Exposed," *id.*; "The War Traders," by G. H. Perris, National Peace Council, 1/- net.

Christ and War

for their sons look with favour on the abolition of war.

It is these facts which explain the present race of armaments. But competition in armaments cannot bring security, for no country is more secure to-day than it was when all only spent half what they do now. And competition in armaments cannot go on for ever ; it must sooner or later lead to bankruptcy or social ruin, provided peace is maintained. But the question is forced upon us, Will peace be maintained ? The rivalry between certain nations is already open and avowed. And such rivalry long continued is likely to provoke bitterness and hatred. Under these circumstances a small misunderstanding or a suddenly presented opportunity for attack will be likely to bring about war ; and that not merely as an outlet for stored-up hatred, but as the only means of escape from the intolerable strain of preparedness. As long as we continue the race in armaments, each nation regarding all others as possible aggressors, there will be many people to preach the doctrine of an inevitable war ; and if enough people can be induced to believe a war inevitable, it will be inevitable, for they will make it so. The whole of Europe is suffering from fear. Each nation desires only peace, yet is in constant dread of an attack from others.

Why cannot we throw away this fear and the terrible burden of war preparation which it brings with it ? Would we attack a nation that began gradually to disarm ? Why should others do so ?

At the present time there is a great agitation going on in the country to establish conscription.¹ Practically all the nations of Europe already have

¹ The advocates of conscription prefer to call it " universal military service," but they certainly intend that it should be compulsory on all the manhood of the nation who are

Reason *versus* Force

this in one form or another, and our Australasian colonies have lately introduced it. But reports show that it has met with great opposition in both Australia and New Zealand.¹

It is not necessary to discuss whether on the continent of Europe conscription has been necessary or not. It is no new thing there, and until some general system of disarmament comes into effect it is likely to continue. The really important question for us is, Would conscription be good for Great Britain?

Those who advocate conscription (Lord Roberts and the National Service League) put forward three reasons why we should institute it :—

(i) We need it for the protection of our country, and in order to have a reserve of trained soldiers if we should need them for foreign work.²

(ii) It is cowardly for the citizen to commit the defence of his country into the hands of hired troops. The brave man ought to take his own share in this work.

(iii) Military training, which most advocates of conscription desire to begin in schools, would arrest the race deterioration which they allege is taking place amongst us.

Before discussing the subject generally, it may well be pointed out that the third reason given, which appears to have very great weight with many people who are not convinced that we need conscription to make our country safe from invasion, does not necessarily point to conscription at all, as the following considerations show :—

physically fit, and as the definition of conscription is "compulsory military service," there seems no need to use three words where one will do.

¹ See Appendix to this chapter, p. 174.

² See Lord Roberts, "Speeches and Letters on Imperial Defence," pp. 67, 76, 77, &c.

Christ and War

(a) Military authorities always reject men who are greatly below the average standard of health or physique. Therefore military training would not arrest physical deterioration in such men.

(b) If the physical deterioration of which the advocates of conscription speak exists, energetic measures should be taken to combat it. But military training is not either the only way or the best way to do this. Better food, better houses, better surroundings in both city and village are even more necessary than physical exercise. And military drill will not produce these. It is now a well-known fact that both in town and country very many of our people have not enough of the simple necessities of life to enable them to develop strong and efficient bodies and minds. Seeing that conscription would not provide these, and by its cost might further depress the spending power of the working-classes, it cannot be the cure for physical deterioration. Let us by all means work for the physical well-being of our people, but let us take a more direct way towards that goal.

(c) For boys of school age those who have studied the subject say that military drill is positively harmful. Sometimes military authorities use Swedish gymnastics as a part of their training. This is good for boys, but it is not essentially military, and can easily be supplied without any connection with military drill.¹

Two very weighty reasons are urged against conscription for Great Britain by many who are by no means advocates of disarmament :—

(i) Owing to our insular position, the navy

¹ On this subject see pamphlet "Military Training considered as part of General Education," E. Adair Impey, issued by National Peace Council, 167, St. Stephen's House, Westminster, S.W., 1d.

Reason *versus* Force

must be our defence. Were our navy defeated, it would not be necessary for the enemy to land troops and meet our army ; he could blockade our ports and starve us out. If by some means without destruction of our navy a hostile force were landed, our standing army and Territorials would be quite sufficient to deal with it, as, owing to difficulties of transport, it could not be very large.

(ii) We cannot have both a large army and a large navy. The country would fail under the strain.

(iii) As possessors of a large empire it is (so it is said) necessary for us to have an army of well-trained long-service men, who can be sent to any part of the world. This we already have. If we were also to have conscription many able military authorities maintain that it would be impossible to get enough men voluntarily to enlist in the long-service forces.

These are reasons against conscription which will probably weigh with people who have no agreement with the attitude taken in this book, but in addition to these there is one simply overwhelming reason against conscription.

Conscription would not be good for this country, because it would mean a very serious increase in armaments, which would at once have the effect, under present circumstances, of causing other countries also to increase their armaments. We should have obtained no greater security, and only raised up more ill-will ; so that there would be more danger of some other nation attacking us, without our being in any better position relatively to meet the attack.

Means of defence that are out of proportion to probability of attack are a waste of men and money ; and when the increase of means of defence is interpreted by other nations as a symptom of desire for

Christ and War

aggression, *as it always is*, such increase becomes no real defence, but a positive danger, *for it increases the probability of attack.*

But, it is urged, "Is there no nobility in the plea that every man should defend his country rather than leave that duty to other people?" We may admit that a noble spirit inspires the thought. But *if by his intense desire to defend his country he increases the probability of its being attacked, he is not defending it at all.* There are other and better ways of defending a country than by arms. Everyone who, by his influence and example, helps to produce friendly relations between the nations of the world is defending his country. Everyone who strengthens the bands of commerce, science, humanitarian effort, and Christianity which bind the world together, or may so bind it, is helping to raise a barrier against war, and is helping to defend his country.

On the other hand, everyone who urges further and greater expenditure on war preparation is causing other nations to fear aggression and thereby encouraging hatred and suspicion, which may in their turn bring about war. Thus he is really making his own nation less secure, and retarding the coming of a better understanding in the world at large.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VII.

The introduction of conscription into Australia and New Zealand is only of late occurrence, and is a matter of very serious import.

In 1911 in both colonies a law came into effect that all boys between the ages of fourteen and eighteen should undergo certain periods of military drill every year. This, as time went on, was to be extended to all men up to the ages of twenty-five. But when the law first came into force, and for some time afterwards, no one who was of age to have a vote came under its provisions. *No voter in these countries, therefore, was at first personally interested in the repeal of the law.*

Reason *versus* Force

It was generally reported at first in this country that opinion in Australasia was enthusiastically in favour of the new laws. But it is now well known that there have been a very large number of refusals to serve. In New Zealand, up to April, 1913—that is, when the law had not been in force for quite two years—already 3,439 youths had been prosecuted for not serving. And it is said that by no means all were prosecuted who refused to serve. For refusing to pay the fines for not serving, more than 100 youths have been in prison. No doubt many of those who refused to serve had no conscientious scruples, but were merely unwilling to undertake irksome duties; but a very considerable number had religious or conscientious objections, and, although it was said that religious objections would be respected, members of the Society of Friends, who are well known as opponents of all war and war preparation, have been imprisoned.

There are said to be indications in both countries of a growing feeling against this compulsory service, for it is found that the military authorities are gaining an undue control in the administration of justice and over the life of the people generally.

One fact of very great importance is that the laws were passed through both countries without being on the party programme before a general election. It is therefore untrue to say that the people have voted for them.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

J. W. Graham, "Evolution and Empire."

G. H. Perris, "Short History of War and Peace" (especially chap. xi.).

H. S. Perris, "Pax Britannica," chap. vii., Anglo-American Relations.

"The Arbitrator in Council," Third Day, pp. 181—254, but especially pp. 228—254; Fourth Day "Perpetual Peace, or the Federation of the World."

And pamphlets—

G. H. Perris, "The War Traders."

P. W. Wilson, "Armaments and Patriotism."

J. T. W. Newbold, "The War Trust Exposed."

E. Adair Impey, "Military Training considered as a part of General Education," National Peace Council.

"Militarism: An Appeal to the Man in the Street," T. Fisher Unwin.

CHAPTER VIII.

WHAT SHALL WE DO ?

So far the attempt has been made to show :—

I. That war is contrary to the spirit of Christ as portrayed in the New Testament (Chapters I. and II.).

II. That the earliest Christians, and practically the whole Church until the end of the third century, recognised this as a fact and acted upon it (Chapter III.).

III. That even when the Church generally had begun to acquiesce, and even officially to participate, in war, there have never been lacking individuals and even at times considerable Christian bodies, who have maintained the primitive attitude in the matter (Chapter IV.).

IV. That not only do the ideal teachings of Christianity show the wickedness of war ; common-sense shows that it is irrational and economically futile (Chapter V.).

V. That no true interest of humanity would suffer if war were to be abolished (Chapter VI.).

VI. That there are many indications at the present time that the day of war is over, but that it is largely vested interest which prevents people from recognising this and abolishing it (Chapter VII.).

It will have been noticed that the earlier chapters, in dealing with the Christian attitude towards war, look at the question from the point of view of

What Shall We Do ?

individual duty ; and that the latter chapters, dealing with facts of international life, look at it from the point of view of what is practically possible.

That these two lines of argument, starting from very different premises, should converge at the same conclusion is a very strong confirmation of what must be the conviction of every true Christian, and indeed of every sincerely upright man, that *what is morally wrong cannot be really necessary* ; or, positively stated, that the enlightened conscience will arrive at a true conception of duty, which the slow process of reasoning and the logic of events will in time confirm.

In endeavouring to answer the question " What shall we do ? " it will be well for us to keep in mind these two sides : individual duty and practical possibilities.

Individual duty seemed clear in the matter to the early Christians and to many in later times. The spirit of Christ was opposed to all war, and they dare not take part in it. But the possibility of abolishing war for them was practically non-existent. So also in the case of the early Quakers ; when the first enthusiastic belief that all Christendom would hear them and return to the primitive faith had faded away, Friends were content with " maintaining their testimony against war," but found almost no opening for working towards its abolition.

At the present day the case is different. While perhaps there never was greater necessity for Christian men to refuse to undertake military service, the possibilities of working in the cause of peace are by no means confined to such refusal. The openly expressed desire of the working people all the world over for peace ; the certainty that war must always bring material and moral loss ; the increasing realisation that, whether they like it or

Christ and War

not, all nations are bound together by ties of mutual interest—all these facts open to us avenues through which we may work towards the goal of settled and permanent peace.

But we must not deceive ourselves into thinking that natural forces and "the progress of evolution" will, without our co-operation, bring about the result we desire. *Man's advance is not decreed by a blind fate which makes progress certain. It is conditioned by his conscious efforts after better things.* And advance in this matter cannot come without a hard struggle, for not only has every worker for peace the dead weight of unreasoning adherence to custom and tradition to overcome, but also the persistent efforts on the other side of those who are personally interested in the continuance of the war system. It behoves us, then, sure as we are that victory will in the end be ours, to use every means we can to bring about perpetual peace in the world.

What then are the ways in which we may help forward the cause of peace?

Strong conviction in the matter will find many ways of working, but three general suggestions may be given and no doubt others will occur to the reader:—

I. Education.

II. Direct effort to influence the action of our own and other nations.

III. Indirect effort. Attempts to assist those forces which are making wars less probable or less possible.

I. Education. The forces at work in the world which make for peace have none of them made war impossible, nor is it likely that they will ever do so. What they do is to make it increasingly irrational

What Shall We Do ?

and futile. Whether war ceases or not does not mainly depend directly on the action of these forces, but on whether people understand their action. Thus the financial unity of the civilised world will not *in itself* prevent war, but when people generally understand that the financial unity of the world makes conquest profitless, impoverishing both sides and enriching no one, they will desire themselves to prevent war.

One great branch of our work for peace then will be to endeavour to convince other people of the truth of the arguments we have been studying, which we may conveniently summarise in the following propositions :—

War is un-Christian ; war is inhuman ; war is irrational ; war is futile ; war is an anachronism.

This educational work may be carried on in all sorts of different ways by different people. One of the great reasons why war still remains the method of settling international disputes is because most people take it for granted. They have never really thought about the question. A chance conversation may set a man thinking and reading, and the result may be a convinced and strenuous peace worker.

Those who are teachers have a splendid opportunity. Listen to what Norman Angell says :—" I have succeeded, in an hour's talk, in giving an intelligent boy of twelve a clearer grasp of the real meaning of money and the mechanism of credit and exchange than is possessed by many a man of my acquaintance running large businesses. Now, if every boy in America, England and Germany could have as clear an idea of the real nature of wealth and money it would in ten years time be an utter impossibility to organise a war scare." ¹

Sunday-school teachers also have excellent oppor-

¹ " The Great Illusion," p. 303, first ed.

Christ and War

tunities, particularly in senior classes. Various aspects of the question may be dealt with in first half-hour discussions in adult schools and addresses at brotherhood meetings.

Those who belong to debating societies may do excellent work by suggesting a debate on the question "Can war be abolished?" and themselves taking the affirmative.

The writer knows of a young man who caused a great impression at a meeting of the National Service League by putting some questions at the end which brought out aspects of the question which few who were present had ever considered.

There is much excellent pamphlet literature which at *suitable times* may be distributed with advantage. And the books on the subject may be lent to one's friends. It is well to remember that different sides of the question cause difficulties to different people. To some the Christian objection to war is obvious, but to put it into practice appears impossible. To such "The Great Illusion" will be the bearer of light. Others, perhaps, see that war is profitless and politically futile, but regard it as a builder of character and a necessary piece of discipline. To such the presentation of the Christian side and other arguments as advanced in "The Passing of War" may be a help. Should another maintain that in the past war has played a part in the development of nations, let him read J. W. Graham's "Evolution and Empire," where this is not denied, but where it is shown that war can no longer help but only hinder such development.

The group method of dealing with the subject in study circles has already proved successful.¹

¹ The Civil Union should be consulted. Its offices are 76, Victoria Street, S.W.

What Shall We Do ?

In the work of education all can take part who have an intelligent grasp of the subject. For this purpose self-denial and ungrudging study may be necessary, but the cause is worth it.

II. Direct effort to influence the action of our own and other countries.

For the average citizen the effort to influence the action of his country means an attempt to modify public opinion. It is therefore very closely related to education, but differs from it in that, while education should concentrate on *making people understand* the newly grasped principles, the attempts to modify public opinion are most effective when aimed at concrete reforms.

(i) Foreign policy. If conquest can now bring no good to the conqueror, as Norman Angell has shown, every enlightened man must desire to substitute for offensive and defensive alliances, which after all are as likely to bring war as to prevent it, an attitude of friendship all round. But foreign policy is still largely determined by ideas, such as the balance of power, which view international affairs as if the chief aim of each State was to extend its borders at the expense of other States. If such were really the chief aim of modern States perhaps defensive alliances would be an advance on each simply fighting for his own hand. But the desire of the peoples is not for territorial expansion. That does not do them any good, and if it be obtained by war does them harm. The people in every State desire justice, prosperity, and peace. We who are working for peace must try to bring foreign policy into line with the real requirements of the present day. If a strong body of enlightened public opinion makes it evident that we do not want alliances—particularly not secret alliances—but that we do desire friendship all round, such opinion will at last move even the Foreign Office.

Christ and War

Parliament now has but little control of foreign policy. And as long as international life is looked upon as a collection of robber-camps, each desiring chiefly to steal what belongs to the others, it is unlikely that Parliament can control foreign policy, for it must of necessity be secret. But when international life is viewed as it really is, as a collection of peoples united by ties of mutual helpfulness and all necessary to one another's welfare, there will be no need for secrecy, and Parliament can know and modify the action of the Foreign Office.

(ii) Arbitration and the Hague Tribunal. *The machinery already exists for settling all disputes between nations without war.* But at present many people distrust arbitration and think that the Hague Conferences have achieved nothing and that the Hague Tribunal is a failure.

We have seen that the distrust of arbitration is ill-founded. Whenever it has been tried it has been successful. We must work for its universal acceptance by the nations. Especially we can advocate unlimited arbitration treaties. The Hague Conference has only met twice. If our Government knew that a strong body of public opinion in this country was in favour of a much more extended use of arbitration, it could put forward proposals at the next conference which might have far-reaching effects in that direction. We must not be disheartened because the ideal of arbitration is not accepted at once. Public opinion only moves slowly, but when it does move, Governments follow it.

An idea is prevalent that some means of enforcing the decisions of an arbitral tribunal is necessary.¹

¹ On this subject see pamphlet by W. Evans Darby, "International Arbitration Procedure," Peace Society, 47, New Broad Street, E.C.

What Shall We Do ?

Many people think the idea of nations voluntarily submitting to arbitration and voluntarily accepting its awards impossible of realisation. They sometimes say, "Before the Hague Tribunal can be effective it is necessary that nations should be *compelled* to submit to arbitration and compelled to accept the awards." For this purpose it has been suggested that the judges at The Hague should have control of an army and navy enlisted from all civilised countries to carry out this compulsion. In a similar way it has been suggested that the four greatest powers—America, England, France and Germany—might compel the world to live at peace. But there is a fallacy behind all this. It assumes that physical force, not mental and moral force, really rules the world. If a State were forced to accept a decision which it believed to be unjust it would cherish the same feelings of bitterness and revenge that a conquered State cherishes. And possibly it would obtain the help of other dissatisfied litigants and make war on the Peace Tribunal itself. So that war would come back again.

The sounder view is that moral force alone should be used. The agreement of every nation to the principle of arbitration should be free ; and if any nation believed an award to be unfair to it, it should be free to submit the case for retrial.

What we desire to do is not to get a *majority* of nations deciding that arbitration must rule instead of war, and *forcing* other nations to accept their decision, but rather, by demonstrating the reasonableness of arbitration and the foolishness of war, to get *all* nations to agree to use arbitration and cease from war.

But in the meantime, before this final result has been reached, it will be open for any two nations, or group of nations, to make unlimited arbitration

Christ and War

treaties for themselves. In fact it seems probable that affairs will take this course, and that a universal arbitration agreement will only be reached after a considerable number of smaller ones have been proved to work well. In other words, it seems probable that the best way to work for permanent peace is to advocate, firstly, agreements between separate States; secondly, a general arbitration agreement; thirdly, the federation of the world. "The Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World" will be the crown and confirmation of the world-peace, rather than its foundation.

But it may be objected that, when nations have agreed to arbitration, an unpopular award may be rejected and the nation rejecting it may prefer to decide by war. To this it may be answered that experience has shown that, when nations have submitted to arbitration, in no case has the award been rejected,¹ *though in some cases it has been far from popular*. When the Alabama claims were decided in 1872 many Englishmen felt that the award was unnecessarily severe on England, and some wilder spirits spoke of war; but the general sense of the people realised that the nobler way was to accept the verdict and pay the damages. Peace was preserved, and the relations of Great Britain and the United States became progressively more cordial.

Nor have we far to look for the reason why when nations agree to arbitrate, the awards will be loyally accepted. Nations are not individuals. When two nations have a dispute to settle there will always in each nation be great differences of opinion on the merits of the question. In each nation there are likely to be some who believe that the claims made by the Government of the other nation are juster than those made by their own; and there

¹ See note on Chap. VII. p. 163.

What Shall We Do ?

are certain to be large numbers who will believe the award to be just, even if it puts their nation in the wrong. And probably a majority of the nation will say when the award is given, "We submitted to arbitration, and we will abide by the verdict." So that it is extremely unlikely that awards will be rejected.

We should then endeavour to inspire confidence in arbitration; we should urge our own country to enter into unlimited arbitration treaties with other nations, and help to make the next Hague Conference an effective instrument towards the ensuring of perpetual peace. One thing that might do much towards this end is that Great Britain should propose the *abolition of the right of capture at sea*. At the last Hague Conference Great Britain stood in the way of the strongly-expressed desire to abolish this right. Were this reform urged by Great Britain instead of being strongly opposed, the way might be opened for general reduction of armaments; for, while the commerce of nations at war is in constant danger of being captured, it is obvious that much larger naval establishments are necessary to protect it than would be needed if such were not the case. While Great Britain continues to maintain the right of capture, which some of the other great powers desire to abolish, we cannot expect Germany, with her increasing sea-borne trade, to rest content with a small navy.

Earl Loreburn (late Lord Chancellor) has just published a book¹ on this question which ought to be studied. A few points which he makes may here be briefly mentioned.

At the present time if two nations were at war each would claim the right to seize the merchant vessels of the other—that is to say, that the right

¹ "Capture at Sea," Methuen, 2s. 6d. (1913).

Christ and War

of plunder, which has been abolished in land warfare, is still in existence on the sea.

(1) In order to be able thus to seize one another's commerce and to protect their own, the nations maintain, in addition to heavily-armoured men-of-war, lighter-armed, fast-sailing cruisers. The expense of the upkeep of these during years of peace is of course very considerable. Were the right of capture given up, all nations could effect considerable economies by reduction in the number of their cruisers.

(2) We, with our enormous navy, could do very great damage to the shipping of other countries. But we have also by far the largest quantity of shipping which would be liable to capture. That is to say, *our liability to suffer damage is greater than our power to inflict it.*

(3) We are much more dependent on sea-borne commerce than any other power; for all others have land connections through which goods can come if there is danger at sea. Also we are more dependent both for food and raw material on the outer world than is any other nation.

(4) *Our right to capture the ships of other countries would be likely to be a source of direct loss to us rather than gain,* because most of the world's maritime insurance is done in London. If, then, our navy captured French or German ships, it would in a large number of cases not be enriching itself at the expense of merchants in France or Germany, but at the expense of underwriters in England. It has been said that the underwriters would have no legal responsibility to pay their claims to those at war with us. This may be the case, but during the Napoleonic wars our underwriters did pay claims on French vessels captured by our navy.¹ And it is

¹ See "Capture at Sea," p. 10.

What Shall We Do ?

said that British underwriters have guaranteed to pay claims similarly made by German shipping firms in the event of a war with Germany.¹

It then seems that in many ways Great Britain's insistence on this form of warfare is likely to do more damage to her own people than to anyone else.

If public opinion in Great Britain was to urge the Government to bring this question up at the next Hague Conference, it is possible that the right of capture would be abolished and the way opened for direct reduction of armaments.

(iii) Disarmament.

The idea has been suggested that perhaps the world will never come to abolish war entirely until some one nation has taken the risk of disarming, and it may be of even perishing as a martyr, in the cause of right. That such willingness to suffer in the cause of peace is essentially Christian can scarcely be denied. But we may very greatly doubt whether any nation in the near future is likely to be sufficiently Christian thus to devote itself.

Now both by those who would desire such a self-offering and by those who oppose it, it seems to be supposed that :

(1) Such a nation would in all probability be attacked and of course conquered ; and

(2) That its conquest would amount to a national annihilation ; that it would have ceased to exist just as an individual martyr ceases to exist. Whether the first supposition is true or not we shall shortly inquire, but the second is not true at all. A nation that is conquered is not wiped out of existence ; even after a long war it remains, for only a comparatively small portion of its people are killed ; and if it did not defend itself, the proportion of

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 11.

Christ and War

killed could scarcely be greater. For to butcher unoffending people in cold blood is something that no troops can be induced to do for long together.

The nation, then, after conquest, would continue to exist. And would its national life be entirely wiped out?

Scarcely. Was the German conquest of France anything more than an episode in French national life? Can one make people give up their language, literature, history, and national ideals? Would it be worth anyone's while to try to do so? Even if the conquering nation were to be as remorseless and cruel as the Turk has sometimes been—a thing that is wildly improbable—it *could not wipe out national life in the conquered nation.*

But even if the martyrdom of a nation does not mean extinction in any real sense, it must be admitted that it is unlikely that any modern nation will become a martyr.

Is, then, our hope of disarmament to rest on the possibility of an agreement between the great powers? Perhaps it may; many people hope that the Hague Conferences may lead to such a general reduction of armaments. But there are very considerable difficulties in the way of it. Ideally it seems perfectly simple; each nation would agree to reduce its military and naval force by a certain proportion each year. But when it comes to fixing how the reduction is to take place the difficulties begin. And then there would, under present circumstances, be constant doubts expressed as to whether each country was faithfully carrying out its own part of the bargain, and these would probably lead to mutual suspicion and possibly even to war. *As long as nations believe that their safety lies mainly in their war preparations there will be great difficulties in the way of a gradual general disarmament.*

What Shall We Do ?

But if nations could be persuaded that their *safety is not dependent on their war preparations, then general disarmament could take place ;* and what is more, *one nation might disarm without waiting for a general agreement.*

But is not national safety dependent on armaments ? If there is any cause why one nation should attack another the fact that the second nation is armed may restrain the first nation from attacking. But it will scarcely be admitted that there is any danger nowadays of one nation attacking another without any cause at all. If, then, all causes of attack can be eliminated, a nation may live in perfect security without armaments.

Probably the following heads comprise all causes for going to war that weigh with modern nations :—

- (1) To defend the oppressed.
- (2) To revenge an injury.
- (3) To gain territory or wealth.
- (4) From jealousy and sheer passion.

A nation that had disarmed would oppress no one ; therefore none could attack it to defend the oppressed. Each of the other reasons might conceivably form a cause of war. But if a nation decided to disarm, it would, of course, be willing to discuss any difficulties it might have with other nations, to submit them without qualification to arbitration, and abide the result. It would, therefore, be scarcely possible for another nation to make war upon it to revenge an injury, or out of passion or jealousy. The one reason which might induce another nation to go to war with it would be to gain its territory or wealth. But it has been shown in Chapter V., following Norman Angell, that the possibility of such gain by war is very illusory, and that a nation does not own its colonies and territories as a man owns his farm.

Christ and War

Therefore, while perhaps it would be too much to say that this cause of war has been entirely eliminated, its strength has been enormously reduced. And we have further to remember that modern nations are ashamed of going to war simply to gain territory. Such a war would not be popular with their people unless passion, too, could be stirred.

But not only would these reasons for attack on an unarmed nation have been almost eliminated. There are very strong reasons against going to war at all which all nations feel, and the strength of these reasons would be in no way reduced by the fact that the nation against whom war was planned was unarmed.

—War is a great interruption to trade, both internal and external. All trade between the belligerents would cease, and this alone in modern Europe would be a serious matter. But the removal from employment of reservists and extra conscripts would also seriously affect trade.

War is recognised by all civilised people as inhuman, irrational, and un-Christian, unless some good purpose can be served by it. And no good purpose could be alleged against a defenceless State.

War between two nations may lead others to join in. An attacking country often lays itself open to an attack from some other State ; so that war, even against unarmed nations, spells danger.

These very adequate reasons against war would be quite enough to make an overwhelming probability against an attack upon an unarmed nation.

Can we say that there is such an overwhelming probability against an attack on an armed nation ? The very increase of armaments creates a risk of attack. What has been the cause of ill-feeling between England and Germany ? Has not increase

What Shall We Do ?

of armaments been at the root of it ? What was it that brought France and Germany to the verge of war over the Nancy incident ? ¹ Was it not the sudden and rapid increase in the fighting forces of both ?

One of the chief causes at the present time which might drive nations to war is jealousy ; and that and passion are both fostered mainly by increase of armaments. The race of armaments, if it continues at its present rate, must lead either to bankruptcy or to war. But while statesmen in every country say " We are powerless to stop it ! " and expect other powers to slacken speed first, it is bound to go on. Would not the bolder course of beginning to disarm be also the wiser one ?

Great Britain is exceptionally well situated to begin disarmament.

(a) Her world-wide financial and commercial connections form a double defence for her. For not only would the nation that attacked her at once suffer financially (see Chapter V.), but if her credit were damaged every other nation would suffer too, and would therefore be strongly impelled to interpose and restore peace.

(b) She has no large or outstanding diplomatic difficulty with any nation. The jealousy which some nations feel towards her is largely founded on her boasted naval superiority, and if she showed that her faith in that had gone, it would disappear.

(c) An island is much more difficult to invade than a continental country, and Great Britain is an island.²

¹ It will be remembered how in the Spring of 1913, shortly after the large increase in the military preparations of both France and Germany, several quite unoffending Germans were rudely and even violently treated in Nancy.

² For difficulties in the conquest of India and the British Colonies, see Chapter V.

Christ and War

If Great Britain were to disarm, a nation that set out to attack her would show a self-sacrificing devotion in wrong-doing with which it is very difficult to credit anyone. For, after all, the majority of every nation is sane.

Some of us believe that Great Britain might lead in this, and ought to lead in it. She has been a pattern of free institutions to all the world; may she not be called to lead the world to an even greater freedom, the freedom from the fear of war?

Perhaps someone objects that all this is theoretic reasoning. How do we know that nations will be restrained from attacking an unarmed nation? We do not *know*, when self-interest, reason, humanity and religion all tell a man to refrain from a difficult and dangerous undertaking, that he will refrain, but we feel it safe to count on his refraining. And in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred we are right. But if experience is needed, we have facts to go on which Norman Angell tells us of in the last edition of "The Great Illusion." It was not the fear of war but the fear of ruin to her commerce through the withdrawal of French credit that in 1911 prevented Germany going to war with France. The armaments of both nations did not help to keep the peace—they *only made the risk of war greater*.¹ Any power going to war with Great Britain has in the same way more to fear from the withdrawal of her credit than from her navy. In the past few years our navy has several times brought us to the verge of war with Germany, but each time our commercial and financial connections with her preserved the peace.

We who oppose compulsory military service are sometimes reproached with being very willing to let others defend us while we enjoy peace and prosperity.

¹ See "The Great Illusion," 1913 ed., pp. 138—158.

What Shall We Do?

We can reply that if all the people of Great Britain thought as we think, *quite irrespective of whether our opinions were shared by the rest of the world, we could disarm to-morrow, and there would be no probability of our being attacked.* At the present time international jealousy and suspicion are almost the only causes from which a European war could spring; and these are largely created and fostered by the race of armaments. We can reply to the advocates of armaments that it is they who manufacture the danger of war, and that we who are attempting to reduce armaments are really defending our country, because we are reducing the probability of attack.

Should we then advocate immediate and complete disarmament? No; the dislocation of the labour market and of capital would be somewhat severe if it were done suddenly. Economists, indeed, tell us that the money liberated from taxes would be sufficient at once to employ very many more men than would be dismissed from army and navy; and the effect of transferring so many from unproductive to productive employment would, in process of time, greatly increase the general prosperity. But it can hardly be doubted that at first it would be difficult for the labour market to adjust itself. As regards the men employed as soldiers and sailors, the obvious method would be simply to cease recruiting; and thus in a comparatively short time army and navy would have disappeared without any perceptible dislocation of the labour market, but with a large release of capital which could be turned into productive work.

A really more serious problem is, What would happen to the men and capital employed in the manufacture of war material? The men, many of them, are experienced in certain peculiar forms

Christ and War

of work and could not easily adapt themselves to other work. And much of the capital of the armament makers is invested in tools and machinery for producing what would be no longer required. Both masters and men would have a real grievance if disarmament were to take place suddenly, or even if the building of war vessels and casting of cannon were suddenly to cease, unless means were taken to employ the men and, as far as possible, the machinery now used in the production of armaments, for some other purpose. There are many great national undertakings which might be started for the general good, were the funds only available ; such as the reclamation of foreshores, the improvement of harbours and docks, the building of bridges, and the improvement of our roads and canals. The labour thrown out of employment in the production of war material could probably all be usefully employed in these ways, and it is even possible that a good deal of the machinery might also be so employed. Experienced engineers, who would investigate the matter and show how our "swords" could thus be "turned into ploughshares", might do valuable work in the cause of peace.

Now these considerations seem to point to a very gradual reduction of taxation ; for these great works would have to be undertaken by the State, and would have to employ all or most of those who had been employed in the production of armaments.

If the whole question were taken up in a far-seeing, statesmanlike way, probably the process of disarmament could be arranged to extend over seven or ten years, but the reduction of taxation would not take place anything like so rapidly.

It will be asked, What would we do with our Indian or Egyptian forces, which are really used

What Shall We Do ?

mainly to keep order ? Of course, these would not at once be disbanded ; but might it not be possible to reorganise them on a more peaceful footing ? And might not our rule gain in efficiency and do more for the good of the subject peoples, which we really have at heart, if it were more sympathetic and less based on force ? Final self-government must be the goal of our rule in these countries. We have taught their educated people to desire it ; we must also train them to be fit for it.

III. Indirect efforts. Attempts to assist those forces which are making war less probable or less possible.

Behind the outward act of war lie the opposition of interests and the spirit of strife from which it springs. Even if the nations were to be convinced that enlightened self-interest, quite apart from humanitarian or religious considerations, demands the abolition of war, and, acting on that conviction were to abolish it, the spirit of strife, greed, and selfishness would still remain in the world, and it is these which are opposed to the spirit of Christ. The abolition of war would have weakened them, for substitution of arbitration for war would be the victory of moral over brute force, which means the strengthening of the powers of good, and the weakening of the powers of evil. But though the tree of evil would have lost one of its greatest branches, the roots would still remain. And it is at the roots that the followers of Jesus Christ must strike. Let us, then, briefly consider certain ways in which we may help the spirit of Jesus Christ to rule in the world. These may not be as direct ways towards the abolition of war as some that have just been discussed, but they are essential for the establishment of peace between men and nations.

Christ and War

(1) *Foreign Missions.* In discussing the possibilities of disarmament attention was almost entirely concentrated on the nations of Europe and America, for at present they are certainly the governing factors of the situation. They all share in a common civilisation, and while only a minority of their people are in any true sense Christian, there is a background of Christianity in their general outlook on life, which has a real, though limited influence on their conduct. But Western nations are not the only nations, nor even the largest. The peoples of the East, India, China, and Japan, are immensely more in number and are heirs of older civilisations, which are pervaded by quite different religious, social, and moral conceptions from those of the Western world. What will their influence be on the future of humanity? The fact that these nations will influence the world has only lately gripped Europeans; and in some cases it has caused something like a panic. Wild words are spoken about a "Yellow Peril," and the danger that our civilisation may be wiped out by these peoples.

In Chapter VI.¹ it was pointed out that the idea that we of the Western world could permanently maintain a superiority to the Eastern nations by means of war and war preparation is illusory. If force is to be the final court of appeal, in the end the larger population will prevail. It was therefore maintained that, far from disarmament laying us open to the attacks of the Eastern peoples, it would probably do much to remove the cause of such attacks, and that our only hope was to treat the Eastern nations with greater consideration and sympathy than has hitherto been usual.

There are at present a multitude of organisations at work attempting to gain the sympathy and love

¹ Page 148.

What Shall We Do ?

of the peoples of the East. Missionary societies, with subscribers in every Christian country, support many thousands of devoted men and women in India, China, Japan, and Africa. These missionaries have already done wonders in improving the spiritual, moral, and social condition of the people they live amongst. Missionaries gain the confidence of the Oriental peoples by their teaching and their lives, and by spreading the knowledge of Jesus Christ lay the foundations of brotherhood and mutual co-operation between East and West.

In all the lands where missionaries are active their influence has made for peace between European and Eastern. "No single person has done so much as the missionary to bring foreigners and the Japanese into close intercourse" is an opinion given in a Japanese newspaper. From Africa the same fact is attested. "For the preservation of peace between the colonists and the natives, one missionary is worth a battalion of soldiers," said Sir Charles Warren, Governor of Natal.

But in almost every district where the missionary works agencies are at work also coming from nominally Christian lands, which hinder the spread of Christianity and provoke hatred and fear amongst the people. Unscrupulous traders, importers of spirits and opium, and slave-dealers, in some parts of the non-Christian world, do more to stir up ill-will than the missionaries can do to produce peace. It is a fact that for many a trader, as for the soldier in Kipling's song, the lands "East of Suez," are countries "where there ain't no ten commandments." All the restraints and proprieties of the Western world are laid aside ; lust and passion are given free rein ; "natives" are regarded as utterly inferior to white men, and often treated as if they were scarcely human. Is it wonderful either that

Christ and War

Western nations are not loved, or that Christian missions are greatly handicapped? But, in spite of all this, missions *do* meet with success, and *do* make for the peace of the world.

Lovers of peace and advocates of disarmament will then do well to support foreign missions, for they must be in part our substitute for defences.

One objection is sometimes raised to foreign missions. It is said, "Why take our religion to these peoples, who have old and tried religions of their own which suit them just as ours suits us?" There are two answers to this.

(i) As education spreads in the East it becomes more and more evident that the religions of the East do not suit even Easterns, for they are being given up, or almost radically altered. For instance, the movements for the reform of Islam which are now going on in India are deeply tinged with modern Christian thought, and are very far removed from the Mohammedanism of Mohammed.

(ii) True unity in the world can only be completely achieved when men come to have some underlying unity in religious belief and experience. There is no religion but Christianity which is likely to achieve this. This fact is admitted by many educated Indians who are not Christians. And that this unity of religious faith will finally come is the conviction of thousands of Christians all over the world. They do not expect uniformity of organisation, nor even a universal acceptance of the same formulated creed, but they do expect a universal recognition of Jesus Christ as the "way to the Father," and a permeation of the world with His spirit. And peace amongst the nations will both greatly aid in the attainment of this ideal, and be progressively confirmed and secured as that ideal is being attained.

What Shall We Do ?

(2) *Social Betterment.* But it is not only to the far-off lands that we must look for a widening and deepening of the peace ideal. At home it is needed, and needed acutely, at the present time.

At the very time of writing strikes of transport workers, 'busmen, and railway employees are in progress. And during the last three years strikes have been very frequent, and their effects have been felt by everyone. People call the method of strike and lockout "Industrial War," and the name is appropriate, for, though it has not quite such evil effects as war and is not so inhuman and irrational, it is just as much an expression of the spirit of strife, and could not take place if their real underlying unity of interest were grasped by employers and employed.

Are we then to say that strikes are wrong and those responsible for calling out the workers are wicked breakers of the peace? (The writer has often heard such statements made, but it has nearly always been by people who strongly believed in the war method between nations, and they would have called out the soldiers to put an end to the strike.)

In this case, as in all, there may be faults on both sides, but the strike and lockout in themselves are not the industrial war—they are only its larger battles. The industrial war is constantly in progress, and the causes of that constant industrial war are the real causes of the sudden and sometimes violent outbreaks which distress us at the present moment; and these are selfishness and unrestrained competition. We all know that at the present time about a third of the working-class population have scarcely enough for the absolute necessities of life,¹ and that a far larger proportion are in constant

¹ See Researches of B. S. Rowntree, "Poverty," and "How the Labourer Lives."

Christ and War

danger of unemployment. If our country were poor, if none of us were more than just comfortably able to get along, we might say "Well, it is sad, but I suppose it can't be helped!" and the working class would, with that patience which is characteristic of it, grin and bear it. But we know, and they know, that *there is enough wealth in the country to keep every man, woman, and child comfortably and properly clad, housed and fed, and leave a great deal to spare to spend on education, recreation and amusement.*¹ And they also know, as we know, that instead of it being so spent enormous sums are simply wasted on the private whims of individuals; so that instead of buying necessities for the many it buys luxuries for the few, luxuries which in many cases do the consumers themselves harm.

What causes the industrial war is a deep-seated sense of injustice. Men know that the toilers do not get a fair proportion of the fruits of their labour, and they desire to rectify this injustice. Nor can one see how else they can rectify it than by the way they have chosen,² unless men of the more fortunate classes sympathetically enter into their difficulties and help them to obtain justice.

It is not fitting in this place to suggest any ready-made scheme of reform, but it is necessary to say that unless Christian people take the labour unrest seriously and endeavour to meet the just demands of the people, they will be allowing another form of war to grow up amongst us and bringing dishonour

¹ L. G. Chiozza Money, in "Riches and Poverty" (Methuen, 1905), showed that the national income in 1904 was equivalent to £40 each for every man, woman and child in Great Britain. The recent Census of Production shows that to-day it is even greater.

² It is not intended to justify all strikes, but merely to point out that as a method, in the absence of a more Christian spirit generally, they seem necessary.

What Shall We Do ?

on the name of Christ. The feeling of class against class is already strong, but it is not too late to introduce justice, which alone can bring an end to the industrial war. And we who desire to put an end to all war must work also for the solving of our social problem.

We must work for peace amongst the nations and within the nation, and the two sides of the work ought to go on together, for they will react upon one another. As arbitration increasingly takes the place of war in international life, less trust will be placed on violent methods in industrial disputes.

(3) *The Spirit of Peace.* But even when calm and peaceful ways of settling disputes have entirely ousted wars, international and industrial, disputes and differences of opinion will continue, and so far as one sees can never be entirely eliminated. How then are we to ensure that they never lead us back again to the "thousand wars of old"? Behind all outward reforms and all alterations in the structure of society there must be inward change in the mind of the individual. If wars and strifes are to be finally abolished, it will be by the power of newer and better thoughts in men's minds. It is the advance in thought which makes people see that war is futile, which in the economic argument against war has such strength at the present day. And increasing clearness of thought and foresight in human affairs will cause further advance towards permanent peace. But the intellectual is not the only important side of man's nature; moral and religious forces also influence his thoughts and aspirations. The Christian ideals of the Kingdom of God, which is a Kingdom of Peace, the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, must be allowed an increasing influence in both national and international affairs. And above all the supreme

Christ and War

example of Jesus Christ, who sacrificed Himself for the good of others, must possess men's minds. For if He is truly the supreme revelation of God, His method of meekness must be in harmony with natural law, and alone can bring order and peace out of the present welter of disorder and strife. Nobody who looks at the present state of human affairs can think it satisfactory. Yet the war method is extolled as the only way of bringing justice and peace, and it has reigned since the dawn of history. The method of Jesus Christ has never been tried on a large scale, but where on the small scale it has been tried it has often achieved wonderful success. If the servants of Christ earnestly endeavoured to practise His method in every department of life, justice, peace, and joy would come to the world, and the time would not be long delayed when the kingdoms of this world are to become the Kingdom of God and His Christ.

FURTHER READING SUGGESTED.

"The Great Illusion," part i., chap. ix. This chapter is not in early editions, for it is concerned with an event which took place in 1911.

"Swords and Ploughshares," chap. xiii.

And pamphlet—

"International Arbitration Procedure: A Review of the Present Position," by W. Evans Darby, Peace Society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SUGGESTIONS for further reading are appended to each chapter. When the book is used as a Study Circle Text-book, it might be well to give each member of the circle the task of reading and abstracting one of the suggested passages for the benefit of the circle at large.

Fewer suggestions for reading are made on Chapters I. to IV. than on Chapters V. to VIII., but the New Testament passages quoted should be *studied in their context*. "The Passing of War" may with advantage be read alongside Chapters I. to IV., and "The Great Illusion" and "The Arbiter in Council" alongside Chapters V. to VIII.

The following list is confined to such books as the writer can personally recommend. For more exhaustive lists the reader is referred to "A Library of Peace and War," edited by F. W. Hirst, and to the "Peace Year Book," both issued by the National Peace Council.

I.—*General Treatment of Subject.*

"The Arbiter in Council." 10s. net. Macmillan & Co. 1906.

Purports to record a discussion of the problems of Peace and War, extending over a week, by men representative of Church, Chapel, Law, Economics, Army and Navy, and the Stock Exchange, under the presidency of the "Arbiter," a retired manufacturer in the north of England. The subjects dealt with are as follows: "The Causes and Consequences of War," "Modern Warfare," "Private Warfare and Duel," "Cruelty," "Perpetual Peace," "The Federation of the World," "A Plea for Arbitration," "The Political Economy of War," "Christianity and War." The treatment is throughout illuminating, and much valuable historical information is given which the general reader may not easily have other means of obtaining.

"The Passing of War." W. L. Grane. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. net. First edition, March, 1912; Third edition (enlarged), March, 1913. Cheap edition 2s. 6d. net.

A very able discussion of the causes of War and the things that make for Peace. The economic argument against War is not neglected, but the ethical and Christian arguments are especially emphasised.

Bibliography

"War or Peace." Hiram M. Chittenden (Brigadier-General U.S. Army). 3s. 6d. net. Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd.

Discusses "The Mistaken Sanctions of War," "Condemnation of War," "Armed Peace," "Rationale of Modern War," "Present Duty" and "Future Hope." Tersely and vigorously written. The criticism of War is especially good. The chapter on "Present Duty" forms a somewhat weakened conclusion from the premises stated in the earlier chapters.

"Swords and Ploughshares." Lucia Ames Mead. 6s. net. Putnams.

Chiefly valuable for historical account of the Peace Movement and of the progress of Arbitration. Written by an American, and with attention chiefly directed to American problems.

II.—*Works showing the Futility of War more from the Economic than the Ethical Standpoint.*

"The Great Illusion." Norman Angell. 2s. 6d. net. Heinemann.

Everyone who wishes to study the questions of Peace and War should read this work. It is well known for presentation of the economic argument that War is futile, but is not confined to that. The second part deals very ably with "The Human Nature and Morals of the Case."

"War and its Alleged Benefits." J. Novikow. 2s. 6d. net. Heinemann.

A short and remarkably convincing proof of the futility of War. An astonishing amount of material is packed into 150 pages of large print.

"Peace Theories and the Balkan War." Norman Angell. 1s. net. H. Marshall & Son.

Very useful for any who think that the Balkan War, or any other war, has disproved the contention of "The Great Illusion."

III.—*Christian Condemnation of War.*

"Essay on War." Jonathan Dymond. 1s. net. Headley Bros., London.

Originally published in 1828, after the death of the author, as part of a large work on the "Principles of Morality." Has long been amongst the Society of Friends (of which J. Dymond was a

Bibliography

member) the standard work on this subject. Deals with the subject essentially from the Christian point of view. In the compass of less than 100 pages the argument is clearly set forth, and all the common objections discussed. It is readable, and little, if anything, in it is out of date.

“Christian Non-Resistance.” Adin Ballou. English edition out of print. Can be obtained at the office of *The Peacemaker*, Room 15, 1305, Arch Street, Philadelphia, U.S.A. Price 50c.

Chiefly of value for the large collection of incidents in which the method of “turning the other cheek” proved triumphantly successful.

“The True Way of Life.” Edward Grubb. 1s. net. Headley Bros. 1909. Pp. 64.

A reply to Mr. St. Loe Strachey’s “New Way of Life,” in which he advocated Conscription. Mr. Grubb urges that such advocacy is frankly pagan, and is calculated to retard all social and humanitarian progress.

“My Religion.” Tolstoi. 2s. 6d. Scott Publishing Co.

The best general statement on the subject of non-resistance. Two criticisms may perhaps justly be passed upon it. Tolstoi is too greatly prejudiced against the Church and its dogmas, and scarcely sufficiently emphasises the positive side of non-resistance which shows itself in self-sacrificing love. But in spite of this it is a most illuminating book.

“Atonement and Non-Resistance.” W. E. Wilson. 6d. net. Headley Bros.

The author holds that the meaning of the Cross of Christ is that God takes the method of non-resistance in overcoming evil. And that therefore it is the Divine method and the only one that can be successful.

Friends and the War. 1s. net. Headley Bros.

Addresses delivered at a conference of members of the Society of Friends and others, held at Llanduduo, September 25th—30th, 1914. Contains much of value for the present time.

Bibliography

IV.—*Historical Treatment of the Subject, showing how War gradually gives way to Peace as man advances.*

“A Short History of Peace and War.” G. H. Perris. 1s. net. Home University Library. Williams & Norgate.

An excellent little book crammed with information.

“Evolution and Empire.” J. W. Graham. New and enlarged Edition, 1s. net. Headley Bros.

Shows that while in the past War has been a factor in the building of nations, now and in the future it can only destroy them.

“Pax Britannica.” H. S. Perris. 5s. net. Sidgwick and Jackson. 1913.

Points out how Peace and Justice gradually emerged in England out of the constant warfare of ancient times. The last chapter on Anglo-American relations is particularly useful, showing how largely already Arbitration has displaced War.

“The Six Panics.” F. W. Hirst. 3s. 6d. net. Methuen. 1913.

Gives the story of the six invasion scares in the last 100 years, and shows how each time the fear of attack, which induced Great Britain greatly to augment her defences, was without any basis of fact.

“International Tribunals.” W. Evans Darby. 15s. net. Dent.

A collection of the various schemes for International Federation and Arbitration which have in the past been propounded, and of instances of Arbitration in the nineteenth century. A most valuable work of reference.

V.—*Not exactly coming under any former Headings.*

“Militia Christi.” Adolf Harnack. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen. M. 3. (In German; not translated.)

A study of the position which the Church in the first three centuries occupied towards War and the Army, including

Bibliography

an investigation of the fondness of the Fathers for military metaphors.

"Military Manners and Customs." J. A. Farrer.
6s. Chatto and Windus. 1885.

Contains an immense amount of varied information about War and its methods.

"Capture at Sea." Earl Loreburn. 2s. 6d. net.
Methuen & Co.

A valuable and timely discussion of the subject indicated in the title. Appeared as a series of letters in the *Manchester Guardian*, Spring, 1913.

"The War of Steel and Gold." H. N. Brailsford.
5s. net. G. Bell & Sons, Ltd.

While agreeing in the main with Norman Angell's contention that war is economically profitless and futile, Mr. Brailsford shows that certain interests stand to gain by war; and that the rivalry in armaments between modern nations is not produced by the necessity of protecting the lives and property of their citizens, but by their competition in gaining control and financially exploiting uncivilised and undeveloped countries.

Pamphlets to which reference has been made.

"Principles of Peace exemplified by the Conduct of the Society of Friends in Ireland during the Great Rebellion of 1798." Thomas Hancock. Peace Society.

"Pennsylvania: a Study in Empire Building." Howard Hodgkin. Published by M. L. Cooke, 90, St. Ann's Hill, Wandsworth, S.W.

"How the Nations Help One Another." M. L. Cooke, 90, St. Ann's Hill, Wandsworth, S.W.

"The War Traders." G. H. Perris. National Peace Council.

"Armaments and Patriotism." P. W. Wilson. *Daily News and Leader*.

"The War Trust Exposed." J. T. Walton Newbold. *Labour Leader*.

"Military Training considered as a part of General Education." E. Adair Impey. National Peace Council.

"International Arbitration Procedure." W. Evans Darby. Peace Society.

"Modern Wars and the Peace Ideal." Norman Angell. Leeds: West Riding A.B.C. Publishing Co., Ltd.

"Militarism: an Appeal to the Man in the Street." Anon. T. Fisher Unwin.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT		PAGE			PAGE
Deut. viii. 3	.	35	Luke vi. 32, 33	.	51
Psalms xci. 11	.	37	vii. 9	.	19
Isaiah ii. 3, 4	.	70	vii. 22, 23	.	43
ix. 1—7	.	32 n.	ix. 52, 53	.	48
xi. 1—8	.	32 n.	x. 18	.	40
Daniel vii. 13	.	32	x. 25—37	.	47
NEW TESTAMENT			xi. 20	.	40
Matthew v.—vii.	.	42	xi. 21, 22	.	18
v. 9	.	21	xii. 32	.	33 n.
v. 20	.	43	xii. 1—40	.	52
v. 22, 39, 40	.	43	xiii. 21	.	41
v. 39	.	21, 24	xiv. 31	.	18
v. 38—42	.	25, 72	xvii. 20, 21	.	40
v. 43, 44	.	48	xxii. 36	.	17
v. 44	.	21	xxiv. 21	.	45
vii. 12	.	21	John xviii. 36	.	21, 23
viii. 10	.	19	Acts x.	.	54
x. 34	.	16	Romans vi. 1—13	.	59, 60
xi. 4, 5, 6	.	43	xii. 1—21	.	63
xii. 28	.	40	xii. 17—21, 58, 59, 63	.	63
xiii.	.	34	xiii. 4	.	54
xxvi. 51, 52	.	17, 21	xiii. 8	.	58
Mark i. 15	.	34, 40	1 Corinthians xii., xiii.,	.	
iv.	.	34	xiv.	.	59, 63, 64, 65
iv. 1—20	.	41	2 Corinthians x. 4	.	24
iv. 12	.	17 n.	Galatians ii. 19—21	.	59
iv. 26—29, 30—32	.	41	v. 16—26, 59, 61, 67	.	67
viii. 27 ff.	.	44	Ephesians iv.	.	63
viii. 34—37	.	45	vi. 10—20	.	56
ix. 30—32	.	45	Philippians ii. 1—18	.	59, 67
x. 32—34	.	45	ii. 12, 13	.	41 n.
x. 42—45	.	46	Colossians iii. 1—17	.	59, 62
xii. 29, 30	.	47	2 Timothy ii. 3, 4	.	56
xiii. 7	.	15	Hebrews i. 1, 2	.	55 n.
xiv. 62	.	33	ii. 1—3	.	55 n.
Luke iii. 14	.	20 n.	vi. 4—8	.	55 n.
iv. 1—13	.	35	x. 26 ff.	.	55 n.
vi. 27—36	.	49	xi. 2	.	55
			xii. 14	.	56
			James iv. 1, 2	.	57
			1 John iv. 18	.	24

GENERAL INDEX

ABOLITION of war, 177
Adult schools, 180
Advantages of war, 126
Alabama claims, 164, 184
American Civil War, Quakers in, 89
Anabaptists, 84, 85
Andrews, C. F., "Renaissance of India," 66
Angell, Norman 13, 119 n., 179, 181, 189
 "Great Illusion," 110, 118, 133, 180, 192
Apostolic attitude, 54
 "Arbiter in Council," 155 n.
Arbitration, 83, 163, 167, 182
 examples of, 149, 164
 obstacle in way of, 145
 should be voluntary, 185
Armaments, 18
 and fear of war, 51
 increase of, 168, 190
 limitation of, 165
 not a preventive of war, 93
 race of, 66
 reduction of, 188
 results of race of, 168
Armenian atrocities, 142
Art, development of, 133
Artificial selection through war, 128
Attack on unarmed nation, 192
Attitude of some sects in Middle Ages, 76

BALANCE of power, 181
Balkan War, 117, 131
Banking and war, 118
Barbarian invasions, 146
Besse's "Sufferings of the People called Quakers," 88
Bishops as warriors, 79
Body of Christ, 63
 "Body, Members of," 53
Boer War, 140
Braithwaite, W. C., "Beginnings of Quakerism," 86 n., 88 n., 90 n., 91 n.
British Army, 173
 conquest and prosperity, 123
 Navy, 173, 192
 and Foreign Bible Society, 99
Brotherhood of man, 47

CADEBY pit disaster, 138
Calvin, 81, 83
Capture at sea, 185
Carlyle, Thomas, 109
Cathari, 76
Cecil, Lord Hugh, 143
Celsus, 71
Chalkley, Thomas, 95
Character and war, 57, 150
Chile and Argentina, 164
China and Western militarism, 66, 147
Christian, armour of the, 56
 Church, attitude of, 53
 cannot fight, 39
 conduct, 61
 to control passions, 82
Christianity and armaments, 104
 final religion, 198
 its power, 52
 religion of spirit, 54
Church, early, 53, 69, 176
 did not defend itself, 16, 17
 members would not fight, 20
 saw opposition between Kingdom of God and kingdoms of the world, 23
Civilised nations and disarmament, 145
Class divisions, 161
 hatred, 65 n., 69
 war, 163 n., 199
Clement of Alexandria, 71
Commercial unity of world, 159
Communities and individuals, 140
Compulsory military service, 54, 192
Conquered nation, result to, 187
Conscription, 170, 174
Co-operation of nations, 104
Cornelius, 54
Cost of war materials, 193
Crime, punishment of, 155
Crimean War, 158
Cross, the, sequel to temptation, 45
Cruelty, diminishing, 106
 of war, 105

DARWINIAN law, 127
 "Dawn of Hope," 103
Defence Acts in Australasia, 90 174
Disarmament, 126, 189

General Index

Disarmament, compatible with justice,
144
possibility of, 193
Disciples to be prepared for suffering, 44
Divine in all men, 51
Doukhobors, 100
Duelling, 109
Dynastic wars, 159

EAST and West, 148
East, danger from, 147, 196
Eastern nations, 104
Economic argument against war, 110,
123
Edinburgh Review, "War and Poetry,"
106 n.
Education and physical force, 156, 178
Edward VII., 164
Enemy, do good to, 49
love to, 21
England and Germany, 120, 190
Erasmus, 81
"Eugenics and Militarism," 128 n.
Evil, Jesus' method with, 26
Evolution of man, 153
"Evolution and Empire," 180

FAMILY of love, 85
Father, the, and the Kingdom, 31
children to copy, 50
Fathers, the, and obedience, 57
Fatherhood of God, 46
Federation of the world, 184
Finance and war, 169
Force no remedy, 51
reason *versus*, 152
Foreign missions, 196
policy, 181
Fourth century Church's attitude, 73, 75
Fox, George, 58, 87
France and Germany in 1911...117, 192
military service, 128
Franco-Prussian War, 51
Francis, St., 77
Franciscan movement, 78
Friends, early, peace testimony of, 87

GERMAN States, disunity of, 132
Germany and England, 120, 190
English commerce, 120
colonies, 120
France in 1911...117, 192
Great Britain, 120, 190
Germany's commerce and war scare, 118
Navy, 168
God's love our example, 51
Golden age, Jewish idea of, 31
rule, 16, 26
Good Samaritan, 47
Graham, J. W., 180

Great Britain, commerce and finance,
192
depends on sea trade, 186
"Great Illusion, 110, 118, 133, 180, 192
Gebel, Conrad, of Zurich, 84
Green, J. R., "Short History of English
People," 113
Grey, Sir Edward, 165
Grotius, Hugo, 82

HAGUE conferences, 166, 185, 188
tribunal, 182
Harnack, "Militia Christi," 70
Heroism in industrial life, 138
Hindu attitude towards war, 66
Hirst, F. W., "Stock Exchange," 114 n.
"History of War and Peace," Perris
163 n.
"Hope, Dawn of," 103
"How the Labourer Lives," 199 n.
Hus, John, Writings of, 80
Husites, 80
Hutton, J. E., "History of Moravian
Church," 81 n.
Hymn of Love, 64

IMPRISONMENT (see Conscription), 175
Indemnities, 119
India, 121
Indian and Egyptian armies, 194
Individual duty, 177
Industrial war, 199
Influence of missions, 196
International relations, 60
"International Tribunals," 82 n.
Irenæus, 69, 71
Irish rebellion, 96
Islam, reform movements in, 198

JESUS CHRIST,
answer of, to John Baptist, 43
concrete method of His teaching, 15
conquers by love, 45
how to practise teaching of, 103
ideals of, 15
practice of, opposed to war, 43
teaching of, applies to State, 28
taken literally, 86
temptation of, 35
the revelation of God, 14
the suffering servant, 45
Jewish conception of brother, 47
expectations of Messiah, 32
Jones, R. M., "Studies in Mystical
Religion," 76 n., 77 n., 79 n., 84 n.,
85 n.
Justice and war, 142, 143
Justin Martyr, 70

KELLOGG, Vernon L., "Eugenics and
Militarism," 128 n.

General Index

"Kingdom and the Father," 31
 Kingdom of God, 22
 not to be fought for, 39
 our Lord's conception of, 33
 present now, 40
 righteousness of, 34
 shown in beatitudes, 42
 subsidiary to Fatherhood, 46
 to be realised in life, 42

LACTANTIUS, 74

Law, 136

Law of love, 58

 Moses, 25

Lollards, 79

Loreburn, Earl, "Capture at Sea," 185

Love, Hymn of, 64

Love to enemies, 21, 51

 fellow-men, 63

Lurting, Thomas, 91

Luther, 81, 83

MARTYR nation, 187

Martyrdom for refusal to fight, 23

"Members of the Body," 53

Menno Simons (Mennonites), 84

Mermaid frigate incident, 88

Messiah, Jewish idea of, 32

Military metaphors in New Testament,
 18, 56

Military training, 171

 and education, 172

Missions, Christian, help cause of peace,
 148, 196

Moral effect of war, 137—138

 force sufficient, 183

 law, 136

Moravian Church, 81, 98

More, Sir Thomas, 81

Morocco difficulty, 117

Mosaic law, 25

NANCY incident, 191

Napoleon, 108, 123

National debt, 115

 life permanent, 188

 Service League, 171, 180

Natural law and war, 137

Nazarenes, 100

New Testament against war, 54, 57

Nicholas, Henry 85

Non-resistance, 24, 98, 99

Novikow, J., 110, 112 n., 128 n., 167

OBEEDIENCE, 57, 72, 138

Old Testament teaching, 55

Origen, 71

PACIFISM, Old and New, 13

Parables of kingdom, 41

Parliament and foreign policy, 182

"Passing of War, The," 136 n., 180

Patriotism, the false, 141

 Lord Roberts on, 161 n.

Paul, St., 55, 60

 and conduct, 58

 epistles of, 67

 on new life in Christ, 19

 opposed to war, 53, 69

"Pax Britannica," 164 n., 165 n.

Peace, direct efforts for, 181

 hindrances to international, 197

 Society, 13

 testimony of early Friends, 86

 under Messiah, 32

 universal, 67

 with all men, 56

Pearson, quoted 'Beginnings of Quaker
 ism,' 86

Peasants' revolt, 81

Penn, William, 93

Pennsylvania, 93

Perris, G. H., 163 n.

 H. S., 164 n., 165 n.

Peter of Chelvic, 80

Physical force, 153

Press responsibility, 169

Progress result of effort, 178

Prosperity, international, 116

 and war, 130

Providence and war, 108

Pugnacity, value of, 150

Punishment, methods of, 155

 on unjust nation, 144

QUAKER attitude towards war, 19

Quakers and Family of Love, 85

 early, 86, 88, 177

 not cowards, 92

 stern choice of, 87

 sometimes soldiers, 90

 suffered for peace, 88

 in American Civil War, 89

 in Irish rebellion, 96

 in New England, 95

 reasons for peace, testimony of
 86

 replies to charges against, 92

REASONS for war, 189

"Reason *versus* Force," 152

Reduction of taxation, 194

Reformation, 81

Reformed Churches, 82

Reformers, 81

Resistance of evil 24, 93

Revenge incompatible with love, 28

"Riches and Poverty," L. G. Chiozza
 Money, 200 n.

Roberts, Lord, on patriotism, 161 n.

Rush-Bagot Agreement, 166

Ruskin on war, 133, 134

General Index

Russo-Japanese War, 65, 149
Russian peasants, 100

SCIENCE, unifying effects of, 161
Self-defence, 27
Self-seeking futile, 68
Sellar, Richard, 88
Shackleton, Abraham, 97
Sharpless, "Quakerism in American Colonies," 93 n.
Sherman, General, 106 n.
Slavery, 153
Smyth, John, 84
Social betterment, 151, 159, 199
Society of Friends. *See* Quakers.
Soldiers, Jesus and, 19
 of Jesus Christ, 56
 of peace, 71
South African War, 107, 153
Spectator, editor of, 140
Spirit and letter, 13
 of peace, 201
State law, 136
Strachey, St. Loe, 137
Strikes, 199
Struggles apart from war, 135, 162
Sword, defence with, 17, 22

TAFT, President, 165
Temple, William, 37 n.
Temptation of Jesus, 34, 37
Tertiaries, Franciscan, 78
Tertullian, 22, 71-73
Tolstoy, 101
Torture, 154
Trade and war, 190
Treaty of Ghent, 165
Troeltsch, Ernst, 82 n.
Trust in God, 52

ULFILAS, 75
Uncertainty of war, 144
Unifying effects of science, 161
Union with Christ, 60

United States and Canada, 165
 Great Britain, 163
 Army, 133
Unity of interest between nations, 160
 in diversity, 64

VENEZUELA intervention, 164
Violence, Jesus Christ on, 22
 personal, decreasing, 152
"Voices in the Wilderness," 75

WALDO, PETER, 77
War an anachronism, 163
 and character, 57
 civilisation, 130
 creative art, 135
 finance, 119
"War and its Alleged Benefits," 111
"War and Poetry," 106 n.
War and the capitalist, 116
 unemployment, 124
 a selective agency, 127
 cannot advance Kingdom 39
 causes of in remote ages, 111
 cost of, 112
 effects of preparation for, 103
 irrational, 107, 176
 Jesus' teaching forbids, 20
 mystics' attitude towards, 86
 naturally disappearing, 157
 said to be countenanced by Jesus, 15
 scares, how made, 169
 spoils of, 113
 temptation to bring peace by, 36
 unprofitable, 110
Wars of liberation, 145 n., 158
 religion, 50, 157
Weiss, J., on Matt. xxvi. 52...22
"Wilderness, Voices in the," 75
Working class solidarity, 160
World's standards not for Christ's followers, 45
Wycliffe, 79

ZISKA, Husite...80

A CATALOGUE OF THEOLOGICAL,
ILLUSTRATED AND GENERAL BOOKS
PUBLISHED BY JAMES CLARKE & CO.,
13 & 14, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.

CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO PRICES,
WITH INDEX OF TITLES AND AUTHORS AT THE END.

New Books and New Editions Marked with an Asterisk.

THE "WORSHIP-SONG" SERIES.

Edited by W. GARRETT HORDER

Including

WORSHIP SONG (803 Hymns).

PSALMS AND CANTICLES (150).

ANTHEMS, ANCIENT AND MODERN (130).

For full particulars as to prices, etc., see separate
Catalogue, which will be sent post free on application.

12/6 net

The Marprelate Tracts. By WILLIAM PIERCE, Author of "An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts." Demy 8vo, cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

The "Tracts" reprinted in this volume are among the most famous in history. They were read eagerly everywhere in England, from the Court to the country farmhouse, when they appeared at the end of the sixteenth century. They are racy in style, and the unknown author, "Martin Marprelate," brings great resources of wit, humour and argument to bear in his tremendous onslaught upon the Bishops. Mr. Pierce gives a very scholarly edition of the tracts, enriched by many valuable and illuminating notes.

Dr. JAMES MOFFATT, in *The British Weekly*, says :—" Will rank as a standard edition. It is not possible to convey any idea of the historical scholarship and research which have gone to the making of this book, but Mr. Pierce will have his reward in the consciousness of serving the cause of religious liberty; and in the gratification of those who have to study the religious situation of England during the sixteenth century. . . . Their historical importance is considerable."

" One of the most valuable contributions to our history ever made."
Principal W. B. SELBIE.

10/6 net**THE POLYCHROME BIBLE**

A New English Translation of the Books of the Bible. Printed in various colours, showing at a glance the composite nature and the different sources of the Books. With many Notes and Illustrations from Ancient Monuments, &c. Each volume is the work of an eminent Biblical scholar of Europe or America, and the whole work is under the general editorship of PAUL HAUPT, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, assisted by HORACE HOWARD FURNESS.

The Book of Ezekiel. Translated by the Rev. C. H. Toy, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages, and Lecturer on Biblical Literature in Harvard University. 208 pp. (89 pp. translation and 119 pp. notes). With nine full-page Illustrations (including a Map of Western Asia) and 102 Illustrations in the Notes. Cloth, gilt top, 10s. 6d. net.

For other Volumes in this Series see page 4.

7/6 net

A Chronicle of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By A. E. McKILLIAM, M.A. Demy 8vo. Photogravure Portrait and 16 illustrations. Cloth boards, gilt top, 7s. 6d. net.

Christ's Vision of the Kingdom of Heaven. By JAMES STIRLING. Author of "The Stewardship of Life," "Finders of the Way," etc. Demy 8vo. Cloth boards, gilt top, 7s. 6d. net.

Hampstead: Its Historic Houses; Its Literary and Artistic Associations. By ANNA MAXWELL. Large foolscap 4to. Cloth boards, gilt top. Four illustrations in colour and 32 full-page illustrations. 7s. 6d. net.

7/6

A History of the United States. By JOHN FISKE, Litt.D., LL.D. For Schools. With Topical Analysis, Suggestive Questions and Directions for Teachers, by FRANK ALPINE HILL, Litt.D., formerly Headmaster of the English High School in Cambridge, and later of the Mechanic Arts High School in Boston. With 180 Illustrations and 39 Maps. Crown 8vo, half leather, gilt top, 7s. 6d.

6/- net**THE POLYCHROME BIBLE**

The Book of Joshua. Translated by the Rev. W. H. BENNETT, M.A., Litt.D., Principal of Lancashire Independent College, Manchester, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. 94 pp., printed in nine colours (43 pp. translation and 51 pp. notes, including an illustrated Excursus on the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets and a List of Geographical Names). Eleven full-page Illustrations (one in colours) and 25 Illustrations in the Notes. Cloth, gilt top, 6s. net.

The Book of Judges. Translated with Notes, by G. F. MOORE, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary. 98 pp., printed in seven colours (42 pp. translation, 56 pp. notes). Seven full-page Illustrations (including a Map in colours and 20 Illustrations in the Notes). Cloth, gilt top, price 6s. net.

For other Volumes in this Series see page 3.

6/- net (*continued*)

***The Meaning and Value of Mysticism.** By E. HERMANN, Author of "Eucken and Bergson." Demy 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 6s. net.

The Person of Christ in Modern Thought. By E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, M.A., Litt.D. Donnellan Lecturer 1911-1912. Author of "Christian Certitude," etc. Demy 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 6s. net.

"A full and exhaustive treatment. . . Dr. Digges La Touche has produced a valuable introduction to the study of Christological speculation of the Modern Period, as well as an apologia for the less fashionable confessional Christology of the sixteenth century."—*The Commonwealth*.

"A book of considerable immediate service. . . There is no side of the subject unvisited."—*Expository Times*.

6/-

Kit Kennedy: Country Boy. By S. R. CROCKETT. With Six Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 6s.

"Mr. Crockett has never given better evidence of originality and dramatic power. . . ."—*Manchester Guardian*.

The House of the Secret. By KATHARINE TYNAN, Author of "For Maisie," "Her Ladyship," &c. Large crown 8vo. Illustrated. Cloth boards, 6s.

"Miss Katharine Tynan can always be depended upon for a good story told in a quiet and charming manner. As ever, it has a well-developed and well-constructed plot. We have thoroughly enjoyed this excellent story, and can recommend it very strongly."—*Bookman*.

The Story of Clarice. By KATHARINE TYNAN. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 6s.

"A story which is on a level with the best Miss Tynan has yet written. It is quiet and simple. We like 'The Story of Clarice,' and its reasonableness and soundness mark it out for popularity."—*Morning Post*.

Helga Lloyd. A Romance of Grasmere. By EDMUND LEE. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 6s.

Friend Olivia. By AMELIA E. BARR. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 6s.

Through Silence to Faith. By DR. NEWMAN SMYTH, Author of "The Place of Death in Evolution," "Old Faiths in New Lights," "The Reality of Faith," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 6s.

"We commend Dr. Smyth's work to the attention of all thoughtful readers."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

America in the East. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, formerly of the Imperial University of Japan, Author of "The Mikado's Empire," "Corea, the Hermit Nation," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, with 19 Illustrations, 6s.

"We need hardly say that there is much that is interesting in the book." *Spectator*.

Rev. T. T. Lynch: A Memoir. Edited by WILLIAM WHITE. With Portrait. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.

5/- net

The Romance of Preaching. Yale Lectures for 1914. By CHARLES SILVESTER HORNE, M.A., Author of "A Popular History of the Free Churches," &c. Large Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 5s. net.

Getting Together. Essays by Friends in Council on the Regulative Ideas of Religious Thought. Edited by JAMES MORRIS WHITON, Ph.D. (Yale). Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 5s. net.

Charles Darwin and other English Thinkers. With reference to their Religious and Ethical value. By S. PARKES CADMAN, D.D. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 5s. net.

Evolution, Life and Religion. By EDWARD BRUCE KIRK, R.F.A.S. (Membre de la Société Astronomique de France, David Elder Lecturer on Astronomy, Glasgow and West of Scotland Technical College). Cloth, 5s. net.

John Smith the Se-Baptist, Thomas Helwys, and the First Baptist Church in England. By WALTER H. BURGESS, B.A. Large crown 8vo, cloth, 5s. net.

5/-

Faith and Verification. With Other Studies in Christian Thought and Life. By PRINCIPAL E. GRIFFITH-JONES, D.D. Large crown 8vo. with Photogravure Portrait, cloth boards, gilt top, 5s.

The Private Relationships of Christ. By T. VINCENT TYMMS, D.D. Author of "The Mystery of God," "The Christian Idea of Atonement," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 5s.

Theology and Truth. By NEWTON H. MARSHALL, M.A., Ph.D. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 5s.

"The book is masterly both in constructive power and in exposition. . . . It is a book which ought to be widely read."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

The Growing Revelation. By AMORY H. BRADFORD, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s.

4/6 net

Dante For the People. Selected Passages from the Divine Comedy in English Verse. By GAUNTLETT CHAPLIN. Large Crown 8vo. Cloth boards, gilt top, 4s. 6d. net.

J. B. Paton, M.A., D.D., Educational and Social Pioneer. By JAMES MARCHANT. Large crown 8vo, Photogravure Portrait, and Illustrations on Art Paper, cloth boards, gilt top, 4s. 6d. net.

4/6

The Christian World Pulpit. Half-Yearly Volumes, cloth boards, 4s. 6d.

"A notable collection of the utterances of Protestant preachers on a wide variety of subjects which many people will rejoice to ponder at leisure."
The Glasgow Herald.

4/-

The Rosebud Annual for 1916. The Ideal Book for the Nursery. Four coloured plates and printed in colour throughout. Handsome cloth boards, 4s. Coloured paper boards, varnished, 3s.

"A veritable treasury of the best of good things."—*Liverpool Mercury.*

Social Salvation. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s.

3/6 net

***Pessimism and Love in Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs**, with Translations from the same. By DAVID RUSSELL SCOTT, M.A., late Pusey and Ellerton Scholar in the University of Oxford. Large Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

***Reconstruction : A Help to Doubters.** By ROBERT F. HORTON, M.A., D.D., Author of "My Belief," "Oliver Cromwell," etc. Large Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

***"J.B." J. Brirley, his Life and Work.** By H. JEFFS, Author of "The Art of Exposition," "Portrait Preaching," "Concerning Conscience," etc. Large Crown 8vo, Photogravure and other Portraits, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

***The Great Unfolding.** Notes on the Revelation. By Colonel G. J. VAN SOMEREN, Indian Army (retired), Author of "Babylon : Past, Present and Future." Large Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

Selections from Brirley. ("J.B." of "The Christian World"), Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

Portrait Preaching. Studies in Bible Characters. By H. JEFFS, Author of "The Art of Exposition," "The Art of Sermon Illustration," etc. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

3/6 net (*continued*)

- My Daily Meditation for the Circling Year.** By J. H. JOWETT, M.A., D.D., Author of "Things that Matter Most," "The Passion for Souls," &c. Handsomely bound in cloth boards, gilt edges, with headband and marker, 3s 6d. net. Leather, 5s. net.
- Advent Sermons.** Discourses on the First and Second Coming of Christ. By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D., Author of "Sermons on God, Christ and Man." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Saint Paul's Flight for Galatia.** By C. H. WATKINS, M.A., D.Th. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top. 3s. 6d. net.
- Effectual Words.** Sermons that led to Christ. Compiled by JOHN REID, M.A., Author of "The First Things of Jesus," "The Uplifting of Life," etc. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top. 3s. 6d. net.
- A Modern Man's Theology.** By DR. WASHINGTON GLADDEN. Large-crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top. 3s. 6d. net.
- Things that Matter Most.** Short Devotional Readings. By J. H. JOWETT, M.A., D.D. Author of "The Transfigured Church," "Sharing His Sufferings," "The Passion for Souls," etc. Handsomely bound in cloth, gilt edges, with headband and marker, 3s. 6d. net. Leather, 5s. net.
- Sermons on God, Christ and Man.** By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. Author of "Modern Theories of Sin," "The Evolution of Old Testament Religion." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Constructive Natural Theology.** By Dr. NEWMAN SMYTH. Author of "Through Science to Faith," "The Reality of Faith," etc. Cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Saint Paul and His Cities.** By R. W. POUNDER, Author of "Historical Notes on the Book of Revelation." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Song of the Well, and other Sermons.** By DAVID BURNS. Author of "Sayings in Symbol." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Until the Day Dawn.** The New Testament Basis for a Doctrine of Inspiration. By REV. J. PULESTON JONES, M.A. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Illustrations from Art for Pulpit and Platform.** By REV. JAMES BURNS, M.A. Author of "Sermons in Art." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

3/6 net (continued)

- The Unfettered Word.** A Series of Readings for the quiet hour. By J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D. Author of "The Gospel of Grace," etc. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Heaven and the Sea.** By FRANK ELIAS. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 16 Illustrations from classical paintings, 3s. 6d. net.
- Concerning Conscience.** Studies in Practical Ethics. By H. JEFFS. Author of "The Art of Sermon Illustration," "Practical Lay Preaching and Speaking to Men," etc. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Voices of To-Day: Studies of Representative Modern Preachers.** By HUGH SINCLAIR. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Spoken Words of Prayer and Praise.** A Book of Prayers. By S. A. TIPPLE. Author of "Days of Old," "Sunday Mornings at Norwood," etc. Cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Fighters and Martyrs for the Freedom of Faith.** By LUKE S. WALMSLEY. 512 pp. Frontispiece in colour and 16 Illustrations on art paper. Large crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.
- What is the Bible? A MODERN SURVEY.** By J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.Phil., Author of "Jesus: Seven Questions," "Problems of Immanence," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Wisdom of God and the Word of God.** By W. HARVEY-JELLIE, M.A., B.D. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Days of Old, and other Sermons.** By S. A. TIPPLE, Author of "Sunday Mornings at Norwood." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Christ or Chaos?** By E. S. WATSON ("Deas Cromarty"). Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Transfigured Church.** By J. H. JOWETT, M.A., D.D., Author of "The Passion for Souls," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Art of Exposition.** By H. JEFFS, Author of "The Art of Sermon Illustration," "Practical Lay Preaching," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Heavenly Visions.** Studies in the Book of Revelation. By Rev. CHARLES BROWN, Author of "Letters of Christ," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

3/6 net (*continued*)

- Westminster Sermons.** Dean H. HENSLEY HENSON, formerly of S. Margaret's, Westminster. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Religion and Miracle.** By GEORGE A. GORDON, D.D., Author of "Through Man to God," "The Christ of To-day," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- A Working Woman's Life.** The Autobiography of MARIANNE FARNINGHAM. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Gospel of Grace.** By J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D., Author of "Christ's Pathway to the Cross," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Winning of Immortality.** By FREDERIC PALMER, Author of "Studies in Theologic Definition." Cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Christian Certitude: Its Intellectual Basis.** By E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, Litt.D. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Life in His Name.** By DAVID M. M'INTYRE, Author of "The Hidden Life of Prayer," &c. Handsomely bound in cloth boards, gilt edges, with headband and marker, 3s. 6d. net.
- Interludes in a Time of Change: Ethical, Social, Theological.** By JAMES MORRIS WHITON, Ph.D. (Yale), Author of "Divine Satisfaction," "Gloria Patri," &c. Cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Modern Theories of Sin.** By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. Thesis approved for the Degree of Doctor of Divinity in the University of London. Demy 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Evangelical Heterodoxy.** By J. MORGAN GIBBON, Author of "The Epistle to the Galatians." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Christian of To-day.** A Brief Description of His Thought and Life. By ROBERT VEITCH, M.A., Author of "The First Christians," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Right Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.** A Biography and Appreciation. By FRANK ELIAS. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Art of Sermon Illustration.** By H. JEFFS, Editor of *The Christian World Pulpit*. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

3/6 net (continued)

- The First Things of Jesus.** By JOHN REID, M.A., of Inverness, Author of "Jesus and Nicodemus: a Study in Spiritual Life." Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- Jesus: Seven Questions.** By J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.Phil., Author of "The New Evangel," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Evolution of Old Testament Religion.** By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Church and Modern Life.** By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., Author of "Who Wrote the Bible?" &c. Cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.
- My Belief.** Answers to Certain Religious Difficulties. By R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D., Author of "Cartoons of St. Mark," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Story of Congregationalism in Surrey.** By E. E. CLEAL. Demy 8vo, 464 pages, 46 Illustrations on art paper and Map, cloth bevelled boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Jesus and His Teaching.** By ERICH VON SCHRENCK, Mag. Theol. Translated by J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.Phil. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Atonement in Modern Thought.** A Theological Symposium. By Professor AUGUSTE SABATIER, Professor HARNACK, Professor GODET, Dean FARRAR, Dr. P. T. FORSYTH, Dr. MARCUS DODS, Dr. LYMAN ABBOTT, Dr. JOHN HUNTER, Dr. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, Dean FREMANTLE, Dr. CAVE, Dr. R. F. HORTON, Rev. R. J. CAMPBELL, Principal ADENEY, Rev. C. SILVESTER HORNE, Rev. BERNARD J. SNELL, and Dr. T. T. MUNGER. Cheap Edition. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- "This interesting work. . . . Among the writers are men of great distinction. . . . Deserves careful attention."—*The Spectator*.
- A Voice from China.** By GRIFFITH JOHN, D.D. Edin., Hankow. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Story of the English Baptists.** By J. C. CARLILE. Large crown 8vo, 320 pages, 8 Illustrations on art paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- The First Christians; or, Christian Life in New Testament Times.** By ROBERT VEITCH, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

3/6 net (continued)**By J. BRIERLEY ("J. B.")**

Faith's Certainties. By J. BRIERLEY ("J.B."), Author of "Religion and To-day," "Ourselves and the Universe," etc. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

Religion and To-day. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

The Life of the Soul. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

"Vigorous in thought, rich in literary allusions, and incisive in style. . . Mr. Brierley is always convincing as well as ingenious."—*Methodist Recorder*.

The Secret of Living. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

"This author has given several thoughtful volumes, but not one in which the ideal and the practical are so well blended and so skilfully contrasted as in the present."—*Liverpool Courier*.

Life and the Ideal. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

"This book is a book to read, and each section is food for constant reference and continued thought."—*Manchester Courier*.

Aspects of the Spiritual. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

"These essays are equal to the best he has yet produced. They cover an immense variety of subjects."—*Daily News*.

Sidelights on Religion. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net.

"Delightfully optimistic, a description which sums up as a whole this very interesting and helpful volume. It deserves to be widespread."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

3/6**By J. BRIERLEY, (J. B.)**

Religion and Experience. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

"This book is quite worthy to be placed alongside of Mr. Brierley's best work."—*Daily News*.

The Eternal Religion. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

"Well written and helpful."—*The Times*.

The Common Life. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

"A book which every minister ought to possess."—*British Weekly*.

Problems of Living. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

"These beautiful and charming essays."—*Hibbert Journal*.

Ourselves and the Universe: Studies in Life and Religion. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

"We have not for a long time read a brighter, cheerier, or wiser book."—*Daily News*.

Studies of the Soul. Eighth Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

DR. HORTON says:—"I prefer this book to the best-written books I have lighted on for a year past."

Our City of God. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

"We say without hesitation that this is a most inspiring work."—*Westminster Gazette*.

3/6 (continued)

A Gamble with Life. By SILAS K. HOCKING, Author of "To Pay the Price." Large crown 8vo, bevelled boards, 3s. 6d.

One of the best stories written by this popular author.

Gloria Patri: or, Our Talks About the Trinity. By J. M. WHITON, Ph.D. (Yale). Cloth, 3s. 6d.

The Christ that is To Be: A Latter-Day Romance. By Sir J. COMPTON-RICKETT, M.P. New Edition. Demy 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

Family Prayers for Morning Use, and Prayers for Special Occasions, Compiled and Edited by J. M. G. Cloth, pott quarto, 3s. 6d.

Preaching to the Times. By Dean H. HENSLEY HENSON. Crown 8vo, cloth extra, 3s. 6d.

"Sound sense and scholarly solidity."—*Dundee Courier*.

The Dutch in the Medway. By CHARLES MACFARLANE. Author of "The Camp of Refuge," &c. With a Foreword by S. R. CROCKETT. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

The Quickenings of Caliban. A Modern Story of Evolution. By Sir J. COMPTON-RICKETT, M.P., Author of "Christianity in Common Speech," &c. Large crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

EMMA JANE WORBOISE'S NOVELS

Crown 8vo, uniformly bound in cloth, 3s. 6d. each.

Violet Vaughan.

Mr. Montmorency's Money.

Overdale.

Chrystabel.

See page 21 for Popular Edition.

AMELIA E. BARR'S NOVELS

Crown 8vo, cloth extra, 3s. 6d. each.

The Beads of Tasmer.

A Border Shepherdess.

She Loved a Sailor.

Paul and Christina.

The Last of the MacAllisters.

The Squire of Sandal Side.

Woven of Love and Glory.

Between Two Loves.

For other books by this Author see pages 5 and 22 (also 31).

3/6 (continued)**THE MESSAGES OF THE BIBLE**

Edited by FRANK KNIGHT SANDERS, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University, and CHARLES FOSTER KENT, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University. Super royal 16mo, cloth, red top, 3s. 6d. a vol. (To be completed in 12 Volumes.)

- I. THE MESSAGES OF THE EARLIER PROPHETS. By Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., and Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D.
- II. THE MESSAGES OF THE LATER PROPHETS. By Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., and Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D.
- III. THE MESSAGES OF ISRAEL'S LAW-GIVERS. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D.
- IV. THE MESSAGES OF THE PROPHETICAL AND PRIESTLY HISTORIANS. By John Edgar McFadyen, M.A.(Glas.), B.A.(Oxon.)
- V. THE MESSAGES OF THE PSALMISTS. By John Edgar McFadyen, M.A.(Glas.), B.A.(Oxon.)
- VII. THE MESSAGES OF THE POETS. By Nathaniel Schmidt, M.A.
- VIII. THE MESSAGES OF THE APOCALYPTICAL WRITERS. By Frank Chamberlin Porter, Ph.D., D.D.
- IX. THE MESSAGES OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE SYNOPTISTS. By Thomas Cuming Hall, D.D.
- X. THE MESSAGES OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. By James Stevenson Riggs, D.D.
- XI. THE MESSAGES OF PAUL. By George Barker Stevens, Ph.D., D.D.
- XII. THE MESSAGES OF THE APOSTLES. By George Barker Stevens, Ph.D., D.D.

Volume VI. will appear shortly.

"Such a work is of the utmost service to every student of the Scriptures."
The Dundee Advertiser.

3/- net

The Personality of Jesus. By CHARLES H. BARROWS. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3s. net.

Poems. By MADAME GUYON. Translated from the French by the late WILLIAM COWPER, with a Prefatory Essay by D. MACFADYEN, M.A. Fcap 8vo, handsomely bound in leather, 3s. net.

Quiet Hints to Growing Preachers in My Study. By CHARLES EDWARD JEFFERSON, Pastor of Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York. Small crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. net.

3/-

The Rosebud Annual for 1916. The Ideal Book for the Nursery. Four Coloured Plates and printed in colour throughout. Coloured paper boards, varnished, 3s. ; cloth boards, 4s.

"A rich fund of enjoyment for the nursery."—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

School Hymns, for Schools and Missions. With Music. Compiled by E. H. MAYO GUNN. Harmonies Revised by ELLIOTT BUTTON. Large Imp. 16mo, 3s.

2/6 net

***The Appeal of Jesus.** By T. S. CAIRNCROSS, B.D., Author of "The Making of a Minister," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

***The Chosen Twelve.** By JAMES GOLDER BURNS, B.D., of Glasgow. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

***Simon Peter's Ordination Day.** Studies in the Twenty-first Chapter of St. John's Gospel. By the Rev. JOHN A. PATTEN, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

***Ambrose Shepherd, D.D.** A Memoir and Sermons. Written by ERIC SHEPHERD. Edited by J. F. SHEPHERD, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, with Portrait, 2s. 6d. net.

The Making of a Minister. By T. S. CAIRNCROSS, B.D., Author of "Steps of the Pulpit." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

A Pulpit Manual. Containing Prayers of Adoration, Confession, Petition, Thanksgiving, and Intercession; Suggestive Summaries; Orders of Service for Sacraments, Marriage, Admission to Communion, Church Festivals, and other Public Occasions. Compiled by JAMES BURNS, M.A., Author of "Illustrations from Art for Pulpit and Platform." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

The Seriousness of Life. Sermons on Practical Subjects, with an Essay on Preaching. By JAMES S. RUTHERFORD, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Through Eyes of Youth. A Book of Poems. By E. CECIL ROBERTS, Author of "Phyllistrata, and other Poems." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Homes and Careers in Canada. By H. JEFFS, Author of "The Good New Times," etc. 16 Illustrations on art paper. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Christian Union in Social Service. By J. C. CARLILE, Author of "The Story of the English Baptists," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Self-Realisation. By C. H. BETTS, LL.D., Author of "Fragments of Thought," "The Education of a Soul," "Living Pleasures," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

2/6 net (continued)

- Who was Jesus ?** The Answer of the New Testament. By D. H. MACONACHIE, B.A., B.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Translation of Faith.** By H. BULCOCK, B.A., B.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Studies in Christian Mysticism.** By REV. W. H. DYSON. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Astronomy Simplified.** By Rev. ALEX. C. HENDERSON, B.D., F.R.A.S. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Phyllistrata, and other Poems.** By E. CECIL ROBERTS. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Spirit and Power.** By Rev. D. M. M'INTYRE, Author of "Life in His Name," "The Hidden Life of Prayer," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Led by a Child ; and other Sermons.** By Rev. ALFRED HOLBORN, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Our Protestant Faith.** By Rev. J. STEPHENS ROOSE, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Story of the Twelve : A Dramatic Poem in eight books.** By ARTHUR HAY STORROW. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Waiting Life : By the River of Waters.** By HUBERT FOSTON, M.A., D.Lit. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Uplifting of Life.** By Rev. JOHN REID, M.A., Author of "The First Things of Jesus," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Unveiled Glory ; or, Sidelights on the Higher Evolution.** By Rev. LUTHER WINTHER CAWS, Author of "The Unrecognised Stranger," "The Unfolding Dawn." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Looking Inwards : Words Addressed to the Soul of the Church.** By EDWARD SHILLITO, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Eucken and Bergson. Their Significance for Christian Thought.** By E. HERMANN. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Messages of Hope.** By GEORGE MATHESON, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E. Author of "Thoughts for Life's Journey," &c. Handsomely bound in cloth boards, gilt edges, 2s. 6d. net ; leather, 4s. net.
- Problems and Perplexities.** By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D., Author of "Modern Theories of Sin," "Evolution of Old Testament Religion," etc. 304 pages, printed on India paper, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Imperishable Word.** By W. CHARTER PIGGOTT. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

2/6 *net continued*

- Constructive Christianity.** By WILLIAM SOUPER, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Peter in the Firelight.** By WILLIAM ALLEN KNIGHT, Author of "Our Syrian Guest," "No Room in the Inn," etc. Illustrated in Colours. Fancy Cover. Large crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.
- A Young Man's Ideal.** By WILLIAM WATSON, M.A., Author of "Prayer," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Modern Minor Prophets.** Edited, with a Chapter on "Lay Preaching and its By-Products," by H. JEFFS, Author of "The Art of Sermon Illustration," "Practical Lay Preaching and Speaking to Men." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Fifty Years' Reminiscences of a Free Church Musician.** By E. MINSHALL. Crown 8vo, Photogravure Portrait, 2s. 6d. net.
- Problems of Immanence.** Studies Critical and Constructive. By J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.Phil., Author of "The New Evangel," "Jesus: Seven Questions," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Sculptors of Life.** A Book for Young Men and Young Women. By THOMAS YATES. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- An Impregnable Faith.** A Modern Pilgrim's Progress from Scepticism through Morality and Religious Optimism to Jesus Christ and the "Good Kingdom." By Rev. DAVID MELVILLE STEWART. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- A Lifted Vell.** A Novel. By J. G. STEVENSON. Cheap Edition. Crown 8vo, 4 Illustrations, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Augustinian Revolution in Theology.** By Rev. THOMAS ALLIN, D.D., Author of "Race and Religion." Illustrated by Comparison with the Teaching of the Antiochene Divines of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Beatitudes and the Contrasts.** By HUBERT FOSTON, M.A., D. Litt. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- King George and Queen Mary.** By HENRY WARWICK. Illustrated by latest portraits on art paper. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Letters to a Ministerial Son.** By A MAN OF THE WORLD. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Religion: The Quest of the Ideal.** By J. M. HODGSON, M.A., D.Sc., D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- The Universal Over-Presence.** By C. H. BETTS, Author of "Fragments of Thought" and "The Education of a Soul." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Thoughts for Life's Journey.** By GEORGE MATHESON, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Author of "Leaves for Quiet Hours." Cheap Edition. Cloth boards, gilt edges, 2s. 6d. net; leather, 4s. net.

2/6 net (*continued*)

Life's Beginnings. Wisdom and Counsel for Daily Guidance. Fifth impression. Printed on India paper and handsomely bound in leather, round corners and gilt edges, boxed, 2s. 6d. net (uniform with "The Pilot"). Also in silk grain cloth, 1s. 6d. net. Velvet calf, round corners, gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

"One can easily understand how a compendium of the thoughts of master minds such as this may be a real stimulus in these days of stress. The battle of the world will be entered upon with a cheerful heart after a thoughtful perusal of the most noble passages allotted to each day by these discriminating anthologists. Should be in constant demand. One of the prettiest and most acceptable gift-books this busy season has seen."

Dundee Advertiser.

The True Christ, and other Studies in "Whatsoever things are true." By W. L. WALKER, Author of "The Teaching of Christ," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Christ in Everyday Life. By EDWARD INCREASE BOSWORTH, Dean of Oberlin Theological Seminary. Fcap 8vo, India paper, cloth boards, round corners, 2s. 6d. net.

Things Most Surely Believed. By J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D., Author of "The Gospel of Grace," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Lyrics of the Soul. A Book of Poems. By MARIANNE FARNINGHAM, Author of "Harvest Gleanings," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt edges, 2s. 6d. net.

Conquering Prayer : or, The Power of Personality. By L. SWETENHAM, Author of "Religious Genius." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

The Immanence of Christ in Modern Life. By FREDERICK R. SWAN. With Introduction by J. BRIERLEY, B.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

The New Evangel : Studies in the "New Theology." By Rev. J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.Phil. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

"May be studied with advantage."—*Spectator.*

Health in the Home Life. By HONNOR MORTEN, Author of "A Complete Book of Nursing," "How to Treat Accidents and Illnesses," &c. Crown 8vo, art leather cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Unglided Gold ; or, Nuggets from the King's Treasury. Selected Passages from the Bible, arranged for Daily Devotional Reading (uniform with "The Pilot"). 384 pages, leather boxed, 2s. 6d. net ; also silk grain cloth, gilt lettering, red edges, 1s. 6d. net,

2/6 net (continued)

The Challenge, and Other Stories for Boys and Girls. By Rev. J. G. STEVENSON, Author of "The Christ of the Children." 4to, cloth boards, 240 pp. Eight Illustrations. 2s. 6d. net.

Leaves for Quiet Hours. By GEORGE MATHESON, F.R.S.E., D.D., LL.D., Author of "Words by the Wayside," &c. New and cheap edition. Handsomely bound in cloth boards, with chaste design in gold, and gilt edges, 2s. 6d. net. Leather, 4s. net.

The Pilot. A Book of Daily Guidance from Master Minds. Contains nearly 2,000 of the choicest extracts systematically arranged for every day of the year. Printed on India paper and handsomely bound in leather, with round corners and gilt edges, 2s. 6d. net; velvet calf, 3s. 6d. net.

"A book of real daily value."—*Sheffield Telegraph*.

My Neighbour and God. A Reply to Robert Blatchford's "God and My Neighbour." By W. T. LEE. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Liberty and Religion. By P. WHITWELL WILSON, Author of "Why We Believe," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

Why We Believe. Papers on Religion and Brotherhood. By P. WHITWELL WILSON. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

The New Testament in Modern Speech. With notes. An idiomatic translation into everyday English from the text of "The Resultant Greek Testament." By the late RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, M.A., D.Litt., Fellow of University College, London, and formerly Head Master of Mill Hill School, Editor of "The Resultant Greek Testament." Edited and partly revised by ERNEST HAMPDEN-COOK, M.A., formerly Exhibitioner and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge. New and revised Edition. Cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net. Leather 4s. net. Thumb Indexed, cloth, 3s. 6d. net. Leather 5s. net. Also on Oxford India paper, cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net. Leather, 5s. net. Persian morocco, yapp, leather lined and silk sewn, round corners, red under gold, 8s. net. Turkey morocco, limp, 8s. 6d. net. (*See also p. 22.*)

The Resultant Greek Testament. Exhibiting the Text in which the majority of Modern Editors are agreed. By the late RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, D.Litt. Cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

A Young Man's Religion and his Father's Faith. By N. MCGHEE WATERS. Small crown 8vo, cloth boards, gilt top, 2s. 6d. net.

"It is an earnestly religious and well-written work."—*The Scotsman*.

2/6

The Good New Times. By H. JEFFS, Author of "Practical Lay Preaching and Speaking to Men." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. 6d.

The Ten Commandments. By G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D. Pott. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

2/- net

The Church and the Next Generation. By RICHARD ROBERTS, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

The Story of Joseph the Dreamer, told by Himself, and Other Poems. By ALFRED CAPES TARBOLTON. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

The Judges of Jesus: Judas, Annas, Peter, Caiaphas, Herod, Pilate's Wife, Pontius Pilate. By Rev. J. G. STEVENSON, Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

The Value of the Old Testament. By BERNARD J. SNELL, M.A., Author of "The Value of the Apocrypha," "Gain or Loss?" &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

The Purpose of the Cross. By B. G. COLLINS. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

Atonement and Progress. By NEWTON H. MARSHALL, M.A., Ph.D., Author of "Theology and Truth." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

Authority and the Light Within. By EDWARD GRUBB, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s. net.

Ideals for Girls. By the Rev. H. R. HAWES, M.A., Author of "Music and Morals." New Edition, crown 8vo, handsomely bound in bevelled boards, gilt edges, 2s. net.

"A book that all parents should place in the hands of their daughters."

The Glorious Company of the Apostles. Being Studies in the Characters of the Twelve. By the Rev. J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D. Cloth boards, gilt top, 2s. net.

"Many think that a readable sermon is a contradiction in terms. Let them read these pages and discover their mistake."—*Examiner*.

The Model Prayer. A Series of Expositions on the Lord's Prayer. By Rev. J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D. New Edition, cloth boards, gilt top, 2s. net.

"Mr. Jones brings a cultured mind, a well-stored memory, and a gift of spiritual insight to the illustration of the Lord's Prayer."

Sunday School Chronicle.

2/-

Simple Cookery. Comprising "Tasty Dishes" and "More Tasty Dishes." Over 500 Tested Receipts. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s.

"A book that should be in every household."

The Children's Paul. A Life of St. Paul specially written for the Young. By Rev. J. G. STEVENSON. 4to, cloth boards, 8 Illustrations on art paper, 2s.

The Christ of the Children. A Life of Jesus for Little People. By Rev. J. G. STEVENSON. Cheap Edition. 4to, cloth boards, 12 Illustrations, 2s.

"It is the very loveliest life of Jesus for children ever written by a long way."—Rev. KINGSCOTE GREENLAND in *The Methodist Recorder*.

Stories of Old. Bible Stories Retold. By C. D. MICHAEL, Author of "Noble Deeds," "Deeds of Daring," &c. Cheap Edition. 4to, 288 pp., cloth boards, 8 illustrations, 2s.

Early Pupils of the Spirit, and What of Samuel? By J. M. WHITON, Ph.D. New Edition, Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s.

The Religion of Jesus. By J. ALLANSON PICTON, M.A, J.P. Crown 8vo, 2s.

CLARKE'S COPYRIGHT LIBRARY

Crown 8vo, tastefully bound in cloth boards, 2s.

The Black Familiars. By L. B. WALFORD.

Kid McGhie. By S. R. CROCKETT.

POPULAR EDITION OF**EMMA JANE WORBOISE'S NOVELS**

Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2s.; bevelled boards, 2s. 6d.

Abbey Mill, The.

Brudenells of Brude, The.

Canonbury Holt.

Chrystabel.

Emilia's Inheritance.

Esther Wynne.

Father Fablan.

Fortune's Favourite.

Fortunes of Cyril Denham, The.

Grey and Gold.

Grey House at Endlestone, The.

Heirs of Errington, The.

His Next of Kin.

House of Bondage.

Husbands and Wives.

Joan Carlsbroke.

Lady Clarissa.

Margaret Torrington.

Milliecent Kendrick.

Mr. Montmorency's Money

Nobly Born.

Oliver Westwood.

Overdale.

Robert Wreford's Daughter.

St. Beetha's.

Singlehurst Manor.

Sissie.

Story of Penelope, The.

Thornycroft Hall.

Violet Vaughan.

Warleigh's Trust.

A Woman's Patience.

For other books by this Author see page 13. (See also p. 81.)

2/-**NEW SERIES OF COPYRIGHT BOOKS**

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, 2s.

- Woven of Love and Glory.** By AMELIA E. BARR.
The Last of the MacAllisters. By AMELIA E. BARR.
The Beads of Tasmer. By AMELIA E. BARR.
A Morning Mist. By SARAH TYTLER.
The Debt of the Damarals. By BESSIE MARCHANT.
A Town Romance ; or, On London Stones. By C. C. ANDREWS.
The Pride of the Family. By ETHEL F. HEDDLE.
Unknown to Herself. By LAURIE LANSFELDT.
The Squire of Sandal Side. By AMELIA E. BARR.
The Scourge of God. By J. BLOUNDELLE-BURTON.
The New Mrs. Lascelles. By L. T. MEADE.
Miss Devereux, Spinster. By AGNES GIBERNE.
Jan Vedder's Wife. By AMELIA E. BARR.

1/9 net

- The New Testament in Modern Speech.** By the late RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, M.A., D.Litt. Pocket Edition (without notes), cloth boards, 1s. 9d. net. Also on Oxford India paper, cloth boards, round corners, gilt edges, 2s. 6d. net. (*See also p. 19.*)

1/6 net**THE "FREEDOM OF FAITH" SERIES**

Fcap 8vo, 128 pp., handsomely bound in Green Leather, with chaste design in gold. Price 1s. 6d. net.

- The Simple Things of the Christian Life.** By G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D.
The Letters of Christ. By CHARLES BROWN.
Christ's Pathway to the Cross. By J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D.
The Crucible of Experience. By F. A. RUSSELL.
The Passion for Souls. By J. H. JOWETT, M.A.
The Value of the Apocrypha. By BERNARD J. SNELL, M.A.
Inspiration in Common Life. By W. L. WATKINSON, M.A.
Prayer. By WILLIAM WATSON, M.A.
A Reasonable View of Life. By J. M. BLAKE, M.A.

"There are precious things in every volume, and the Series deserves success."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

1/6 net (continued)

- Through Many Windows.** Some Modern Parables. By ERNEST A. BIRCH. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- The Man on The Road.** By CHARLES H. BETTS, LL.D., A.S.P.. Author of "Fragments of Thought," "Living Pleasures," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- The Well by Bethlehem's Gate.** By WILLIAM ALLEN KNIGHT, Author of "The Song of our Syrian Guest," etc. Handsomely bound in cloth boards, gilt, 1s. 6d. net.
- The Way and the Work.** A Manual for Sunday School Teachers. By J. W. WIMMS, M.A., B.Sc. (Lecturer on the Theory and Practice of Education, University of London), and the REV. FREDERICK HUMPHREY. Crown 8vo, cloth boards. 1s. 6d. net.
- A Popular History of the Free Churches.** By C. SILVESTER HORNE, M.A. Cheap Edition, with additional Chapter. Cloth boards. 1s. 6d. net.
- Christ and War.** The Reasonableness of Disarmament on Christian, Humanitarian and Economic Grounds. A Peace Study Text Book. By WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D. Preface by Dr. RENDEL HARRIS. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 1s. 6d. net. Cloth limp. 1s. net.
- Life's Little Lessons.** Addresses to Children. By VERNON GIBBERD. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- For Childhood and Youth.** Ideals of the Modern Sunday School. By THISELTON MARK, D.Lit., B.Sc., Author of "The Teacher and the Child," etc. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Facets of Faith.** Aspects of Spiritual Life and Thought. By A. W. BLUE. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Life's Beginnings.** Wisdom and Counsel for Daily Guidance. Silk grain cloth, 1s. 6d. net. Also printed on India paper and handsomely bound in leather, round corners and gilt edges, boxed, 2s. 6d. net (uniform with "The Pilot"). Velvet calf, round corners, gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.
- "An admirable compilation. The authors have read widely and their selections from modern religious writers are made with taste and judgment. A very attractive and helpful little book."—*British Weekly*.
- The Wayfarer at the Cross Roads.** By ARTHUR PRINGLE. Author of "The Faith of a Wayfarer." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Old Testament Stories in Modern Light.** A BIBLE GUIDE FOR THE YOUNG. By T. RHONDDA WILLIAMS, Author of "The Christ Within," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- J. H. Jowett, M.A., D.D.** A CHARACTER STUDY. By FRANK MORISON. Illustrations on art paper. Fancy paper boards, 1s. 6d. net.

1/6 net (*continued*),

- The Way of Prayer.** By JOHN EDGAR MCFADYEN, D.D., Author of "The Divine Pursuit," "Prayers of the Bible." Fancy boards, gilt top, 1s. 6d. net.
- Chats with Women on Everyday Subjects.** By EDITH C. KENYON, Author of "A Queen of Nine Days," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Faith and Form.** An Attempt at a Plain Re-statement of Christian Belief in the Light of To-day. By HENRY VARLEY, B.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- The Invisible Companion and Other Stories for Children.** By EDWARD W. LEWIS, M.A., B.D., Author of "The Unescapable Christ," &c. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Sharing His Sufferings.** By J. H. JOWETT, M.A., D.D., Author of "The Passion for Souls," &c. Small crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net; leather 2s. 6d. net.
- The Reasonableness of Jesus.** By FRANK Y. LEGGATT, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- The Making of Heaven and Hell.** By J. M. BLAKE, M.A., Author of "A Reasonable View of Life," &c. Small 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Ideals in Sunday School Teaching.** By ALFRED H. ANGUS, B.Sc. With Foreword by J. H. Jowett, M.A., D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Notes on the Life and Teaching of Jesus.** By EDWARD GRUBB, M.A., Author of "Authority and the Light Within." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net; limp cloth, 1s. net.
- The Faith of a Wayfarer.** By ARTHUR PRINGLE. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Jesus or Christ?** By Rev. J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., D.Phil., Author of "The New Evangel," "Jesus: Seven Questions." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Who Wrote the Bible?** By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., Author of "The Growing Revelation," &c. New and cheap edition, 256 pages, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Reasons Why for Congregationalists.** By Rev. J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.
- Ungilded Gold; or, Nuggets from the King's Treasury.** Selected Passages from the Bible, arranged for Daily Devotional Reading (uniform with "The Pilot"). 384 pages, silk grain cloth, gilt lettering, red edges, 1s. 6d. net; leather, boxed, 2s. 6d. net.
- Women and their Work.** By MARIANNE FARNINGHAM, Author of "Harvest Gleanings," "Women and their Saviour." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.

1/6 net (continued)

- Sunny Memories of Australasia.** By Rev. W. CUFF. Crown 8vo, cloth boards. Portraits and Illustrations. 1s. 6d. net.
- Britain's Hope Concerning the Pressing Social Problems.** By JULIE SUTTER, Author of "Britain's Next Campaign," &c. Cloth boards; 1s. 6d. net.
- Burning Questions.** By WASHINGTON GLADDEN. Cheap Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d. net.
- Reform in Sunday School Teaching.** By Professor A. S. PEAKE. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.

1/6

- Storehouse for Preachers and Teachers.** A Treasury of Outline Texts and Sermons. By J. ELLIS, Author of "The Seed Basket," &c., &c. Cloth boards, 1s. 6d.
- Words by the Wayside.** By GEORGE MATHESON, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Author of "Thoughts for Life's Journey," &c. New Edition. Oblong, cloth boards, gilt top, 1s. 6d.
- The Children's Pace ; and other Addresses to Children.** By Rev. J. S. MAVER, M.A., of Paisley. F'cap, 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d.

SMALL BOOKS ON GREAT SUBJECTS

- Pott 8vo, bound in buckram cloth, 1s. 6d. each. (*See also p. 30*).
- The Christ Within.** By Rev. T. RHONDDA WILLIAMS.
- Old Pictures in Modern Frames.** By J. G. GREENHOUGH, M.A.
- The Conquered World.** By R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D.
- Social Worship an Everlasting Necessity.** By JOHN CLIFFORD, D.D.
- Types of Christian Life.** By E. GRIFFITH-JONES, D.D.
- How to Become Like Christ.** By MARCUS DODS, D.D.
- The Way of Life.** By H. ARNOLD THOMAS, M.A.
- Character Through Inspiration.** By T. T. MUNGER, D.D.
- Infoldings and Unfoldings of the Divine Genius, in Nature and Man.** By JOHN PULSFORD, D.D. New Edition.
- The Jealousy of God.** By JOHN PULSFORD, D.D.
- The Supreme Argument for Christianity.** By W. GARRETT HORDER.
- Reconsiderations and Reinforcements.** By JAMES MORRIS WHITON.

1/- net

- * **Sir Galahad.** By JAMES BURNS, M.A., Author of "The Happy Warrior." With Photogravure Frontispiece of Watts's famous picture "Sir Galahad." Bound in khaki cloth, 1s. net.
- * **Around the Guns. Sundays in Camp.** By JAMES BLACK, M.A., of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo, khaki cloth boards, with design in colours, 1s. net.
- Kaiser or Christ?** Sermons by the BISHOP OF LONDON, DR. JOHN CLIFFORD, DR. S. PARKES CADMAN, DR. GRIFFITH-JONES, DR. C. H. WATKINS, REV. THEODORE WOOD. Demy 8vo, paper covers, 1s.
- Quaint Rhymes for the Battlefield.** By a QUONDAM CRICKETER (C. D. STUDD, Belgian Congo, 1913). Cloth boards, 1s. net.
- Sweet Peas and Antirrhinums.** How to Grow Them to Perfection. By WILLIAM CUTHBERTSON, Author of "Pansies, Violas and Violets." Crown 8vo, coloured paper boards and frontispiece in colour, 1s. net. Written in a popular form for the amateur gardener by one who is a thorough master of his subject.
- The Way of Remembrance.** By J. A. HUTTON, M.A. Tastefully bound in blue and white with gilt lettering. 1s. net.
- God, Humanity and the War.** By G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D., Author of "Simple Things of the Christian Life," &c. 1s. net.
- Christ and War.** The Reasonableness of Disarmament on Christian, Humanitarian and Economic Grounds. A Peace Study Text Book. By WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D. Preface by Dr. RENDEL HARRIS. Crown 8vo, cloth limp. 1s. net. Cloth Boards. 1s. 6d. net.
- The Christian World Album of Sacred and Standard Compositions for the Pianoforte.** Edited by W. H. JUDE. (Uniform with "The Christian World Album of Sacred Songs."). Paper cover, 1s. net. Cloth boards, 2s. net.
- * **The Call of the King.** National Letters to Women. By ANNIS BURDALANE. Demy 8vo, bound in Purple and Gold with Ribbon. 1s. net.
- The Great Embassy.** Studies in the Growth of Christianity. By CUTHBERT MCEVOY, M.A. Foolscep 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. net.
- Everychild.** By HAROLD BEGBIE, Author of "Broken Earthenware." Crown 8vo, Frontispiece and cover in colours. 1s. net.
- The Christian World Album of Sacred Songs.** Containing 94 Sacred Songs, in old notation and tonic-sol-fa, selected from the choicest works of the most eminent composers. Edited by W. H. JUDE. 160 pages, paper cover, 1s. net; cloth boards, 2s. net.
- The Seed of the Kingdom.** Devotional readings from the letters of Isaac Penington. Selected by JENNIE STREET (*Editor of the Sunday School Times*). Fancy Boards, 1s. net.

1/- net (continued).

How to Cook. The Art of Cooking made easy, with a chapter on the use of a gas oven. By J. S. MARSHALL. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. net.

Our Life Beyond. By J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D., Author of "Christ's Pathway to the Cross," "The Gospel of Grace," etc., etc. cloth boards, gilt lettering, 1s. net; white cloth, padded, in box, 1/9 net.

Flowers from the Master's Garden. By A. E. WINTER. Cloth boards, gilt lettering, 1s. net.

Ecce Vir : Jesus and Modern Manhood. By D. MELVILLE STEWART. Author of "An Impregnable Faith." F'cap 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. net.

The Garrisoned Soul. Meditations on "Peace, Perfect Peace," by C. E. P. ANTRAM. Fancy cloth, 1s. net.

"It is just the sort of book, chaste and beautiful, contents and binding alike, that would make a pretty present on a birthday or a Church festival. Its size and its type make it suitable also to send to an invalid. Indeed, its cheering chapters would to many such, we are sure, act like a tonic, and be an efficient co-worker with the physician."—*Sheffield Telegraph*.

Women and their Saviour. Thoughts of a Minute for a Month. By MARIANNE FARNINGHAM, Author of "Harvest Gleanings," &c. Cloth, 1s. net.

"These 'thoughts of a minute for a month of mornings,' are the outpourings of an entirely unaffected piety."—*Glasgow Herald*.

Reasons Why for Free Churchmen. By Rev. J. D. JONES, M.A., B.D. Small 8vo, cloth boards, 1s. net.

The Price of Priestcraft. By HOWARD EVANS. Crown 8vo, paper covers, 1s. net; cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

"We wish for it a very large circulation. No one has served the cause of religious freedom better than Mr. Howard Evans by his labours in the Press and elsewhere."—*British Weekly*.

Sunday Afternoon Song Book, with Tunes. Compiled by H. A. KENNEDY and R. D. METCALFE. 1s. net. Words only, 12s. 6d. per hundred net.

"The airs have been selected and arranged under the editorship of Mr. R. D. Metcalfe, and add so much to the value of the collection that this edition will easily supersede all others and give the work a new popularity with choral societies and others interested in church music."

The Scotsman.

1/-

Oliver Cromwell. By R. F. HORTON, D.D., Author of "John Howe," "The Teaching of Jesus," &c., &c. Sixth Edition. Nineteenth Thousand. 1s.

"Worthy a place in the library of every Christian student."

Methodist Recorder.

Rome from the Inside ; or, The Priests' Revolt. Translated and Compiled by "J. B." of The Christian World. Third Thousand. F'cap. 8vo, 1s.

PICTURE BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG

Pictures by LOUIS WAIN, HARRY B. NEILSON, J. A. SHEPHERD,
ELSIE BLOMFIELD, etc.

Printed in colour, varnished boards, 1s.

1/-

***Animal Fancy-Land.**

Animal Picture-Land.

Animal Happyland.

Merry Times in Animal Land.

Animals in Fun-Land.

The Merry Animal Picture Book.

Holidays in Animal Land.

Animal Playtime.

Animal Gambols.

Outline Text Lessons for Junior Classes. By GLADYS DAVIDSON,
Author of "Kindergarten Bible Stories," &c. F'cap 8vo,
cloth boards, 1s.

"The book is simple and practical, and will be found suggestive and
helpful by teachers."—*Sunday School Chronicle*.

How to Read the Bible. Hints for Sunday School Teachers and other
Bible Students. By W. F. ADENEY, M.A. New and Revised
Edition. Cloth boards, 1s.

"A most admirable little work. We know of no book which deals with
this subject so clearly and adequately within so small a compass. It speaks
of itself modestly as "Hints for Sunday-school Teachers and other Bible
Students," but it is one of the very few manuals which are well worth the
study of the clergy."—*The Guardian*.

Short Talks to Boys and Girls. By J. C. CARLILE, Author of "Talks
to Little Folks." Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1s.

A Religion that will Wear. A Layman's Confession of Faith.
Addressed to Agnostics, by a SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIAN. Crown
8vo, cloth boards, 1s.

The Divine Satisfaction. A Review of what should and what should
not be thought about the Atonement. By J. M. WHITON.
Crown 8vo, paper, 1s.

1 /- (*continued*)

Health and Home Nursing. By Mrs. LESSELS MATHER, Health Lecturer to the Northumberland County Council. F'cap. 8vo, cloth, 1s.

A book that should be in every household. Contains chapters on The Care of the Invalid, Homely Local Applications, Feeding the Invalid, Infection and Disinfection, Care of the Teeth, The Value of Foods, Influenza, its Causes and Prevention, Consumption, its Causes and Prevention, Digestion and Indigestion, Headaches, Home Nursing of Sick Children, What to do till the Doctor Comes, Habit in Relation to Health, The Health of the Town Dweller.

Helps to Health and Beauty. Two Hundred Practical Prescriptions by a Pharmaceutical Chemist. Price 1s.

"This little book contains two hundred practical prescriptions or formulæ, for preparations for the hair, hands, nails, feet, skin, teeth, and bath, in addition to perfumes, insecticides, and medicaments for various ailments. As far as possible technical language is avoided, and the directions are clear and concise."—*Pharmaceutical Journal*.

Morning, Noon and Night. By R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D. F'cap 8vo, parchment cover with gold lettering, 1s.

"Deeply suggestive, and as earnest as its fancies are pleasing and quaint."
Dundee Advertiser.

Wayside Angels, and Other Sermons. By W. K. BURFORD. Pott 8vo, cloth, 1s.

Tasty Dishes. A Choice Selection of Tested Recipes, showing what we can have for Breakfast, Dinner, Tea and Supper. It is designed for people of moderate means who desire to have pleasant and varied entertainment for themselves and their friends. It is a book of genuine and tested information. New Edition. Thoroughly revised and brought up to date. 130th Thousand. Crown 8vo, 1s.

"No home ought to be without this timely, useful, and practical family friend."—*Brighton Gazette*.

More Tasty Dishes. A Book of Tasty, Economical and Tested Recipes. Including a Section on Invalid Cookery. A Supplement to "Tasty Dishes." New Edition. Price 1s.

"Every recipe is so clearly stated that the most inexperienced cook could follow them and make dainty dishes at a small cost."—*Pearson's Weekly*.

"The recipes given have been carefully tried and not been found wanting."
The Star.

Talks to Little Folks. A Series of Short Addresses. By Rev. J. C. CARLILE. Crown 8vo, art vellum, 1s.

"No one who reads this book can reasonably doubt that Mr. Carlile is master of the difficult art of catching and sustaining the interest of young people. He is wise enough to dispense with the preacher's framework, texts, introductions, &c., and at once he arrests attention by a direct question or a brief story."—*Literary World*.

Christianity in Common Speech: Suggestions for an Every-day Belief. By Sir J. COMPTON-RICKETT, M.P. Demy 8vo, 1s.

1/-

RECITATION BOOKS

By MARY E. MANNERS

Crown 8vo, Linen Covers, 1s. each.

A Tale of a Telephone, and Other Pieces."Narrative pieces, suitable for recitation."—*Outlook*.**Aunt Agatha Ann : and other Ballads.** Illustrations by ERNOLD A. MASON and LOUIS WAIN."Excellent pieces for recitation from a popular pen."—*Lady's Pictorial*.

SMALL BOOKS ON GREAT SUBJECTS

(CHEAP EDITION).

Bound in red cloth, 1s. each. (*See also p. 25.*)

The Taste of Death and the Life of Grace. By P. T. FORSYTH, M.A., D.D.	Faith and Self-Surrender. By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D., D.C.L.
The Conquered World. By R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D.	Martineau's Study of Religion. By RICHARD A. ARMSTRONG
The Christian Life. By W. M. SINCLAIR, D.D.	The Kingdom of the Lord Jesus. By ALEXANDER A. MACKENNAL, D.D.
The Way of Life. By H. ARNOLD THOMAS, M.A.	

6d. net

***They that Wait.** A Message for War Time. By J. H. JOWETT, M.A., D.D. In this daintily produced brochure, Dr. J. H. Jowett presents an inspiring message of comfort and hope for these times of anxiety and strain. 6d. net.

Recollections of Newton House. By REV. ISAAC HARTILL, F.R.G.S., F.R.Hist.S. 64 pages, with frontispiece. 6d. net.

C. Silvester Horne. In Memoriam. April 15th, 1865—May 2nd, 1914. 64 pages, with portrait, 6d. net.

The Birthday of Hope. By J. D. JONES, M.A., D.D. Illustrated. Printed on art paper, with fancy cover and ribbon, 6d. net. Padded white cloth, lettering in gold, boxed, 1s. 6d. net.

The Ship's Engines. A Parable. By the late T. CAMPBELL FINLAYSON, D.D. In vellum cover, 6d. net.

Rev. J. H. JOWETT says :—" I am so glad you are issuing the article in the shape of the little booklet. I am sure it will be very helpful to many people, and will bring light and leading to many bewildered souls."

6d.

England's Danger. By R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D. Price 6d.
Contents: ROMANISM AND NATIONAL DECAY; ST. PETER
AND THE ROCK; TRUTH; PROTESTANTISM; HOLY SCRIPTURE;
PURGATORY.

"Good fighting discourses. They contend that Roman Catholicism has ruined every country in which it prevails and controvert the leading positions taken by Roman theologians."—*Scotsman*.

CLARKE'S SIXPENNY SERIES

Demy 8vo, Paper Covers.

Studies of the Soul. By J. BRIERLEY, B.A.
Violet Vaughan. By EMMA JANE WORBOISE.
The Bow of Orange Ribbon. By AMELIA E. BARR.
Jan Vedder's Wife. By AMELIA E. BARR.
A Daughter of Fife. By AMELIA E. BARR.
Ourselves and the Universe. By J. BRIERLEY.

4d. net

Holy Christian Empire. By Rev. PRINCIPAL FORSYTH, M.A., D.D.,
of Hackney College, Hampstead. Crown 8vo, paper cover,
4d. net.

"Rich in noble thought, in high purpose, in faith and in courage. Every sentence tells, and the whole argument moves onward to its great conclusion. Dr. Forsyth has put the argument for missions in a way that will nerve and inspire the Church's workers at home and abroad for fresh sacrifice."
London Quarterly Review.

3d. net

School Hymns, for Schools and Missions. Words only. Compiled
by E. H. MAYO GUNN. Cloth limp, 3d.; cloth boards, 6d.;
music, 3s.

2d. net

The Sunday Afternoon Song Book. Containing 137 Hymns. For
use at "Pleasant Sunday Afternoons," and Other Gatherings.
Compiled by H. A. KENNEDY, of the Men's Sunday Union,
Stepney Meeting House. Twentieth Thousand, 2d; music,
1s.

"Contains 137 hymns, the catholic character of which, in the best sense of the term, may be gathered from the names of the authors, which include Tennyson, Ebenezer Elliott, Whittier, G. Herbert, C. Wesley, Thomas Hughes, J. H. Newman, Longfellow, Bonar, and others. While the purely dogmatic element is largely absent, the Christian life, in its forms of aspiration, struggle against sin and love for the true and the good, is well illustrated."—*Literary World*.

INDEX OF TITLES

	PAGE		PAGE
Abbey Mill, The	21	Christian World Album of Sacred and Standard Compositions for the Pianoforte.	26
Advent Sermons	8	Christian World Pulpit, The	7
America in the East	5	Christianity in Common Speech	29
Animal Fancyland	23	Chronicle of the Archbishops of Canterbury, A	4
Animal Gambols	23	Chrystabel	13, 21
Animal Happyland	23	Church and Modern Life, The	11
Animal Playtime	23	Church and the Kingdom, The	25
Animal Picture Land	23	Church and the Next Genera- tion, The	20
Animals in Fun-Land	23	Common Life, The	12
Apocalyptical Writers, The	14	Concerning Conscience	9
Messages of the	14	Conquered World, The	25, 30
Apostles, The Messages of the	14	Conquering Prayer	18
Appeal of Jesus, The	15	Constructive Christianity	17
Around the Guns	26	Constructive Natural Theology	8
Aspects of the Spiritual	12	Crucible of Experience, The	22
Asquith, The Right Hon. H. H., M.P.	10	Dante for the People	7
Astronomy Simplified	16	Darwin, Charles, and other Eng- lish Thinkers	6
Atonement and Progress	20	Daughter of Fife, A	31
Atonement in Modern Thought, The	11	Days of Old	9
Augustinian Revolution in Theology	17	Debt of the Damarals, The	22
Annt Agatha Ann	30	Divine Satisfaction, The	23
Authority and the Light Within	20	Dutch in the Medway, The	13
Beads of Tasmer, The	13, 22	Earlier Prophets, The Messages of the	14
Beatitudes and the Contrasts, The	17	Early Pupils of the Spirit	21
Between Two Loves	13	Ecce Vir	27
Birthday of Hope, The	30	Effectual Words	8
Black Familiars, The	21	Emilia's Inheritance	21
Border Shepherdess, A	13	England's Danger	31
Bow of Orange Ribbon, The	31	Esther Wynne	21
Britain's Hope	25	Eternal Religion, The	12
Brudenelle of Brude, The	21	Eucken and Bergson	16
Burning Questions	25	Evangelical Heterodoxy	10
Call of the King, The	26	Everychild	26
Canonbury Holt	21	Evolution, Life and Religion	6
Challenge, The	19	Evolution of Old Testament Religion, The	11
Character through Inspiration	25	Exposition, The Art of	9
Chats with Women on Every- day Subjects	24	Ezekiel, The Book of	3
Children's Pace, The	25	Facets of Faith	23
Children's Paul, The	21	Faith and Form	24
Chosen Twelve, The	15	Faith and Verification	6
Christ and War	23, 26	Faith of a Wayfarer, The	24
Christ in Everyday Life	13	Faith and Self-Surrender	30
Christ of the Children, The	21	Faith's Certainties	12
Christ or Chaos?	9	Family Prayers for Morning Use	13
Christ that Is To Be, The	13	Father Fabian	21
Christ, The Private Relation- ships of	6	Fifty Years' Reminiscences of a Free Church Musician	17
Christ Within, The	25	Fighters and Martyrs for the Free- dom of Faith	9
Christ's Pathway to the Cross	22	First Christians, The	11
Christ's Vision of the Kingdom of Heaven	4	First Things of Jesus	11
Christian Certitude	10	Flowers from the Master's Garden	26
Christian Life, The	30	For Childhood and Youth	23
Christian of To-day, The	10	Fortune's Favourite	21
Christian Union in Social Service	15		
Christian World Album of Sacred Songs, The	26		

	PAGE
Fortunes of Cyril Denham, The	21
"Freedom of Faith" Series,	
The	22
Friend Olivia	5
Gamble with Life, A	13
Garrisoned Soul, The	27
Getting Together	6
Gloria Patri	13
Glorious Company of the	
Apostles, The	20
God, Humanity and the War	26
Good New Times, The	20
Gospel of Grace, The	10
Great Embassy, The	26
Great Unfolding, The	7
Grey and Gold	21
Grey House at Endlestone, The	21
Growing Revelation, The	7
Hampstead, Its historic houses ;	
its literary and artistic associa-	
tions	4
Health and Home Nursing	29
Health in the Home Life	18
Heaven and the Sea	9
Heavenly Visions	10
Heirs of Errington, The	21
Helga Lloyd	5
Helps to Health and Beauty	29
His Next of Kin	21
History of the United States, A	4
Holidays in Animal Land	28
Holy Christian Empire	31
Homes and Careers in Canada	15
Horne, C. Silvester	30
House of Bondage, The	21
House of the Secret, The	5
How to Become Like Christ	25
How to Cook	27
How to Read the Bible	28
Husbands and Wives	21
Ideals for Girls	20
Ideals in Sunday School Teach-	
ing	24
Illustrations from Art for Pulpit	
and Platform	8
Immanence of Christ in Modern	
Life, The	18
Imperishable Word, The	16
Impregnable Faith, An	17
Infoldings and Unfoldings of	
the Divine Genius	25
Inspiration in Common Life	22
Interludes in a Time of Change	10
Invisible Companion, The	24
Israel's Law Givers, The Messages	
of	14
Jan Vedder's Wife	22, 31
"J.B." J. Brierley, his Life and	
Work	7
Jealousy of God, The	25
Jesus and His Teaching	11
Jesus or Christ ?	24

	PAGE
Jesus : Seven Questions	11
Jesus, The Messages of, Accord-	
ing to the Gospel of John	14
Jesus, The Messages of, Accord-	
ing to the Synoptists	14
Joan Carisbrooke	21
Joshua, The Book of	4
Jowett, J. H., M.A., D.D.	23
Judges of Jesus, The	20
Judges, The Book of	4
Kaiser or Christ	26
Kid McGhie	21
Kingdom of the Lord Jesus,	
The	30
King George and Queen Mary	17
Kit Kennedy : Country Boy	5, 21
Lady Carlissa	21
Last of the MacAllisters, The	
.	13, 22
Later Prophets, The Messages	
of the	14
Leaves for Quiet Hours	19
Led by a Child	16
Letters of Christ, The	22
Letters to a Ministerial Son	17
Liberty and Religion	19
Life and Teaching of Jesus,	
Notes on the	24
Life and the Ideal	12
Life in His Name	10
Life of the Soul	12
Life's Beginnings	18, 23
Life's Little Lessons	23
Lifted Vell, A	17
Looking Inwards	16
Lynch, Rev. T. T. : A Memoir	6
Lyrics of the Soul	18
Making of a Minister, The	15
Making of Heaven and Hell,	
The	24
Man on The Road, The	23
Margaret Torrington	21
Marpelate Tracts, The	3
Martineau's Study of Religion	30
Meaning and Value of Mysticism	5
Merry Animal Picture Book,	
The	28
Merry Times in Animal Land	28
Messages of Hope	16
Messages of the Bible, The	14
Millicent Kendrick	21
Miss Devereux, Spinster	22
Model Prayer, The	20
Modern Man's Theology, A	8
Modern Minor Prophets	17
Modern Theories of Sin	10
More Tasty Dishes	29
Morning Mist, A	22
Morning, Noon, and Night	29
Mr. Montmerency's Money	13, 21
My Belief	11
My Daily Meditation for the Circ-	
ling Year	8
My Neighbour and God	19

	PAGE
New Evangel, The	18
New Mrs. Lascelles, The	22
New Testament in Modern Speech, The	19, 22
Nobly Born	21
Old Pictures in Modern Frames	25
Old Testament Stories in Modern Light	23
Oliver Cromwell	27
Oliver Westwood	21
Our City of God	12
Our Life Beyond	27
Our Protestant Faith	16
Ourselves and the Universe,	12, 31
Outline Text Lessons for Junior Classes	28
Overdale	13, 21
Passion for Souls, The	22
Paton, J. B., M.A., D.D.	7
Paul and Christina	13
Paul, The Messages of	14
Person of Christ in Modern Thought, The	5
Personality of Jesus, The	14
Pessimism and Love in Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs	7
Peter in the Flarelight	17
Phyllistrata and Other Poems	16
Pilot, The	19
Poems. By Mme. Guyon	14
Poets, The Messages of the	14
Polychrome Bible, The	3, 4
Popular History of the Free Churches, The	23
Portrait Preaching	7
Prayer	22
Preaching to the Times	13
Price of Priestcraft, The	27
Pride of the Family, The	22
Problems and Perplexities	16
Problems of Immanence	17
Problems of Living	12
Prophetic and Priestly His- torians, The Messages of	14
Psalmists, The Messages of the	14
Pulpit Manual, A	15
Purpose of the Cross, The	20
Quaint Rhymes for the Battlefield	26
Quickening of Caliban, The	13
Quiet Hints to Growing Preachers in My Study	14
Reasonable View of Life, A	22
Reasonableness of Jesus, The	24
Reasons Why for Congrega- tionalists	24
Reasons Why for Free Church- men	27
Recollections of Newton House	30
Reconsiderations and Reinforce- ments	25
Reconstruction, A Help to Doubters	7
Reform in Sunday School Teach- ing	25

	PAGE
Religion and Experience	12
Religion and Miracle	10
Religion and To-day	12
Religion of Jesus, The	21
Religion: The Quest of the Ideal	17
Religion that will Wear, A	23
Resultant Greek Testament, The	19
Robert Wreford's Daughter	21
Romance of Preaching	6
Rome from the Inside	27
Rosebud Annual, The	7, 15
School Hymns	15, 31
Scourge of God, The	22
Sculptors of Life	17
Secret of Living, The	12
Seed of the Kingdom, The	26
Selections from Brierley	7
Self-Realisation	15
Seriousness of Life, The	15
Sermon Illustration, The Art of	10
Sermons on God, Christ and Man	8
Sharing His Sufferings	24
She Loved a Sailor	13
Shepherd, Ambrose, D.D.	15
Ship's Engines, The	30
Short Talks to Boys and Girls	28
Sidelights on Religion	12
Simon Peter's Ordination Day	15
Simple Cookery	21
Simple Things of the Christian Life, The	22
Singlehurst Manor	21
Sir Galahad	26
Sissle	21
Small Books on Great Subjects	25, 30
Smith, John, the Se-Baptist, Thomas Helwys, and the First Baptist Church in England	6
Social Salvation	7
Social Worship an Everlasting Necessity	25
Song of the Well, The	8
Spirit and Power	16
Spoken Words of Prayer and Praise	9
Squire of Sandal Side, The	13, 22
St. Beetha's	21
St. Paul and His Clites	8
St. Paul's Flight for Galatia	8
Storehouse for Preachers and Teachers	25
Stories of Old	21
Story of Clarice, The	5
Story of Congregationalism in Surrey, The	11
Story of Joseph the Dreamer, The	20
Story of Penelope, The	21
Story of the English Baptists, The	11
Story of the Twelve	16
Studies in Christian Mysticism	16
Studies of the Soul	12, 31
Sunday Afternoon Song Book	27, 31

	PAGE
Sunny Memories of Australasia	25
Supreme Argument for Christianity, The	25
Sweet Peas and Antirrhinums	26
Tale of a Telephone, A	30
Talks to Little Folks	29
Taste of Death and the Life of Grace, The	30
Tasty Dishes	29
Ten Commandments, The	20
Theology and Truth	6
They that Wait	30
Things Most Surely Believed	18
Things that Matter Most	8
Thornycroft Hall	21
Thoughts for Life's Journey	17
Through Eyes of Youth	15
Through many Windows	23
Through Science to Faith	5
Town Romance, A	22
Transfigured Church, The	9
Translation of Faith, The	16
True Christ, The	18
Types of Christian Life	25
Unfettered Word, The	9
Ungilded Gold	18, 24
Universal Over-Presence, The	17
Unknown to Herself	22
Until the Day Dawn	8
Unveiled Glory, The; or, Side-lights on the Higher Evolution	16
Uplifting of Life, The	16

	PAGE
Value of the Apocrypha, The	22
Value of the Old Testament	20
Violet Vaughan	13, 21, 31
Voices of To-day: Studies of Representative Modern Preachers	9
Waiting Life, The; By the River of Waters	16
Warleigh's Trust	21
Way and the Work, The	23
Wayfarer at the Cross Roads, The	23
Way of Life, The	25, 30
Way of Prayer, The	24
Way of Remembrance, The	26
Way-side Angels	29
Well by Bethlehem's Gate, The	23
Westminster Sermons	10
What is the Bible?	9
Who was Jesus	16
Who Wrote the Bible?	24
Why We Believe	19
Winning of Immortality, The	10
Wisdom of God and the Word of God, The	9
Woman's Patience, A	21
Women and their Saviour	27
Women and Their Work	24
Words by the Wayside	25
Working Woman's Life, A	10
Woven of Love and Glory	13, 22
Young Man's Ideal, A	17
Young Man's Religion, A	19

INDEX OF AUTHORS

	PAGE
Abbott, Lyman	11
Adeney, W. F.	11, 28
Allin, T.	17
Andrews, C. C.	22
Angus, A. H.	24
Antram, C. E. P.	27
Armstrong, R. A.	30
Barr, Amelia E.	5, 13, 22, 31
Barrows, C. H.	14
Begbie, H.	26
Bennett, Rev. W. H.	4
Betts, C. H.	15, 17, 23
Birch, E. A.	23
Black, J.	26
Blake, J. M.	22, 24
Blomfield, Elsie	28
Bloundelle-Burton, J.	22
Blue, A. W.	23

	PAGE
Bosworth, E. I.	18
Bradford, Amory H.	6
Brierley, J.	7, 12, 31
Brown, C.	9, 22
Bullock, H.	16
Burdalane, Annis	26
Burford, W. K.	29
Burgess, W. H.	6
Burns, David	8
Burns, Rev. J.	8, 15, 25
Cadman, S. P.	6, 26
Cairncross, T. S.	15
Campbell, R. J.	11
Carlile, J. C.	11, 15, 28, 29
Cave, Dr.	11
Caws, Rev. L. W.	16
Chaplin, Gauntlett	6
Cleal, E. E.	11
Clifford, John	25, 26

	PAGE
Collins, B. G.	20
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.	13, 29
Cowper, W.	14
Crockett, S. R.	5, 21
Cuff, W.	25
Cuthbertson, W.	26
Davidson, Gladys	28
Dods, Marcens	11, 25
Dyson, W. H.	16
Elias, F.	9, 10
Ellis, J.	25
Evans, H.	27
Farningham, Mari- anne, 10, 18, 24,	27
Farrar, Dean	11
Finlayson, T. Camp- bell	30
Fiske, J.	4

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Forsyth, P. T.	11, 30, 31	La Touche, E. D.	5, 10	Sabatier, A.	11
Foston, H.	16, 17	Lee, E.	5	Sanders, F. K.	14
Fremantle, Dean	11	Lee, W. T.	19	Schmidt, N.	14
Furness, H. H.	3	Leggatt, F. Y.	24	Schrenck, E. von	11
Gibberd, Vernon	23	Lewis, E. W.	24	Scott, D. R.	7
Gibbon, J. Morgan	10	London, Bishop of	26	Scottish Presbyte-	
Giberne, Agnes	22	McEvoy, Cuthbert	26	rian, A.	28
Gladden, Washington		Macfadyen, D.	14	Shepherd, E.	15
7, 8, 11, 24, 25		McFadyen, J. E.	14, 24	Shepherd, J. A.	28
Godet, Professor	11	Macfarlane, Charles	13	Shillito, Edward	16
Gordon, George A.	10	M'Intyre, D. M.	10, 16	Sinclair, H.	9
Greenhough, J. G.	25	Mackennal, Alex-		Sinclair, W. M.	30
Griffis, W. E.	5	ander	30	Smyth, Newman	5, 8
Griffith-Jones, E.		McKillop, A. E.	4	Snell, Bernard J.	
6, 25, 26		Maconachie, D. H.	16	11, 20, 22	
Grubb, E.	20, 24	Manners, Mary E.	30	Somerer, J. Van	7
Gunn, E. H. M.	15, 31	Man of the World, A	17	Souper, W.	17
Guyon, Madame	14	Marchant, Bessie	22	Stevens, G. B.	14
Hall, T. C.	14	Marchant, J.	6	Stevenson, J. G.	
Hampden-Cook, E.	19	Mark, Thistelton	23	17, 19, 20, 21	
Harnack, Professor	11	Marshall, J. S.	27	Stewart, D. M.	17, 26
Harris, Rendel	23, 26	Marshall, N. H.	6, 20	Stirling, James	4
Hartill, I.	30	Martineau, Jas.	30	Storrow, A. H.	16
Harvey-Jellie, W.	9	Mason, E. A.	30	Street, J.	26
Haupt, P.	3	Mather, Lessels	29	Studd, C. D.	26
Hawels, H. R.	20	Matheson, George		Sutter, Julie	25
Heddle, Ethel F.	22	16, 17, 19, 25		Swan, F. R.	18
Henderson, Alex. C.	16	Maver, J. S.	25	Swetenham, L.	18
Henson, Dean H.		Maxwell, A.	4	Tarboiton, A. C.	20
Hensley	10, 13	Meade, L. T.	22	Thomas, H. Arnold	
Hermann, E.	5, 16	Metcalfe, R. D.	27	25, 30	
Hill, F. A.	4	Michael, C. D.	21	Tipple, S. A.	9
Hocking, S. K.	13	Minshall, E.	17	Toy, Rev. C. H.	3
Hodgson, J. M.	17	Moore, G. F.	4	Tymms, T. V.	6
Holborn, Alfred	16	Morgan, G. Camp-		Tynan, Katharine	5
Holder, W. Garrett	25	bell	20, 22, 26	Tytler, S.	22
Horne, C. Silvester		Morison, F.	23	Varley, H.	24
6, 11, 23		Morten, Honnor	18	Veitch, R.	10, 11
Horton, R. F.	7, 9	Munger, T. T.	11, 25	Wain, Louis	28, 30
11, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31		Nelson, H. B.	28	Walford, L. B.	21
Humphrey, F.	23	Orchard, W. E.		Walker, W. L.	18
Hunter, John	11	8, 10, 11, 16		Walmsley, L. S.	9
Hutton, J. A.	26	Palmer, Frederic	10	Warschauer, J.	
"J. B." of <i>The</i>		Patten, J. A.	15	9, 11, 17, 18, 24	
<i>Christian World</i>	27	Peake, A. S.	25	Warwick, H.	17
J. M. G.	13	Pharmaceutical		Waters, N. McG.	19
Jefferson, C. E.	14	Chemist, A.	29	Watkins, C. H.	8, 26
Jeffs, H.		Picton, J. Allanson	21	Watkinson, W. L.	22
7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 20		Pierce, W.	3	Watson, E. S.	9
John, Griffith	11	Pizzott, W. C.	16	Watson, W.	17, 22
Jones, J. D.	9, 10, 18,	Porter, F. C.	14	Weymouth, R. F.	19, 22
20, 22, 24, 27, 30		Pounder, R. W.	8	White, W.	5
Jones, J. P.	8	Pringle, A.	23, 24	Whiton, J. M.	6, 10, 13, 21, 25, 28
Jowett, J. H.		Pulsford, John	25	Wimms, J. W.	23
8, 9, 22, 24, 30		Reld, Rev. J.	8, 11, 16	Williams, T. R.	23, 25
Jude, J. H.	26	Riggs, J. S.	14	Wilson, P. W.	19
Kennedy, H. A.	27, 31	Roberts, E. Cecil		Wilson, W. E.	23, 26
Kent, C. F.	14	15, 16		Winter, A. E.	26
Kenyon, Edith C.	24	Roberts, R.	20	Wood, T.	26
Kirk, E. B.	6	Roose, Rev. J. S.	16	Worboise, Emma	
Knight, W. A.	17, 23	Russell, F. A.	22	J. 13, 21, 31	
Lansfeldt, L.	22	Rutherford, J. S.	15	Yates, T.	17

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 957 693 5

